The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXV, No. 4 — October, 1951

CONTENTS

Chalcedon: October 451. Part I
Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R. 241

The Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* and Our Blessed Lady's Coredemption . *Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.* 255

Bishop Sheen's Threshold Apologetics . *Daniel J. Shine, S.J.* 274

Our Rosary Beads . . . . . *John J. Galvin, C.SS.R.* 280

The Layman's Obligation to Perfection
Robert W. Gleason, S.J. 284

The Parish Credit Union in the Federal Credit Union System
J. T. Croteau 293

ANSWERS TO QUESIONS

Low Mass of a Bishop 303

Scapular Medal 303

Holy Communion Problems 304

Indulgence *in articulo mortis* 304

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Cross of Chalice 305

Patronal or Titular Feast of a Church 305

War Problems 306

The Age of Ordination 307

Candidates for the Minor Seminary 308

ANALECTA 309

BOOK REVIEWS

De Poenitentia: Tome II, *by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.* . 313

Moral Theology of the Confessions of St. Augustine, *by John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.* 317

Der Lehrstuck-Katechismus Als Ein Trager Der Katechetischen Erneuerung, *by Franz Michel William* 319

Available in the following bindings each with 4 silk ribbon markers, slip cover, and boxed:

No. 370—Genuine flexible Morocco grain leather, Chrisma (Symbol of Christ) tooled on cover $7.50

No. 372—Genuine Levant grain leather, gold stamping on spine $10.00

No. 374—Genuine Levant grain leather, Chrisma etched in gold on cover $11.00

No. 376—Genuine, heavy French Morocco Leather, Florentine decoration inside covers, blank hinges back and front $12.00

No. 380—Genuine, heavy French Morocco, maroon color, genuine leather lining with sumptuous red leather panels, genuine leather hinge reinforcements, gold embellished frame inside front and back covers, blank hinges front and back $22.00

The Missal you will be proud to own, to use, to give, is the

"CABROL" Roman Missal

NEW 1951 EDITION

A masterpiece of liturgical scholarship, literary excellence and custom craftsmanship—in a variety of beautiful full leather bindings at amazingly low prices.

The New Revised 1951 Edition, in Latin and English for every day in the year, contains Masses for all new Feasts in the Church Calendar, plus a special supplement for North America.

The new "CABROL" is for those who demand the best. See your bookseller about it NOW—or write us for descriptive circular.

P. J. KENEDY & SONS

12 Barclay St., New York 8, N. Y.

CHALCEDON: OCTOBER, 451

Part I

As all the world knows, no sooner had the great orthodox churchmen of the fourth century clarified the doctrine of the absolute equality of the three divine Persons in the Trinity, than, with the opening of the fifth century, the doctrine of the relation between the two natures in Jesus Christ was called into question. At the Council of Ephesus in A.D. 431, Nestorius, then patriarch of Constantinople, was condemned and deposed for having denied that in Our Lord Jesus Christ, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity, there is an inseparable, physical union between the two natures, the divine and the human; and in particular, for having refused to acknowledge that the Blessed Virgin Mary was the *Theotokos*—the Mother of God.

Unfortunately the proceedings at Ephesus had been anything but peaceable and orderly. They had ended in a rupture between the two principal champions of orthodoxy, St. Cyril of Alexandria and Bishop John of Antioch, as a result of which the secular arm exercised by the Emperor Theodosius II played an important part in bringing the council to a close. But more unfortunately still, the two divergent schools of theological thought represented by Alexandria and Antioch felt themselves pushed further apart despite the fact that in January of 433 both Cyril and John signed a statement of union, proclaiming their theological agreement and doctrinal conformity.[1]

In his refutation of Nestorius, who would admit of merely a moral union of the two natures in the Logos, Cyril insisted upon the profound unity of the theandric composite, speaking indifferently of a *union in the hypostasis,* and of a *physical union,*[2] and vigorously underlining this unity by quoting the pseudo-Athana-

[1] Cyril's letter of March or April 433, titled *Laetentur coeli* proclaimed this agreement to all the world (ed. C. Heurtley, *De fide et symbolo* [Oxford, 1889], pp. 199-204. Cf. my forthcoming *The Council of Chalcedon A.D. 451,* chap. 2.

[2] Cf. H. du Manoir de Juaye, *Dogme et spiritualité chez S. Cyrille D'Alexandrie,* pp. 124-34.

sian "the one nature of the Word God incarnate."[3] In further clarifying his thought, he even spoke of "two natures before the union and one nature after the union" thereby purporting to reject the heresy of Apollinaris of Laodicea by insisting upon the integrity of the human nature which was endowed with a logical soul.[4]

Unhappily at the moment Greek thought had not reached a definite arrangement in regard to the terminology to be applied to the Person and the natures in Christ. The Creed of Nicea had used the words "substance" and "hypostasis" in an identical sense, and though the Cappadocian fathers had begun to distinguish carefully between nature, hypostasis, and person in regard to the Trinity itself, their differentiations had not been taken over completely in the Christological field. As a consequence, whereas at Alexandria the theologians identified hypostasis and person, and underlined the unity of the hypostasis or of the person while speaking indifferently of a union "in the hypostasis" or of a "physical union," the Antiochene fathers spoke rather of two natures, or of two hypostases in the incarnate Word, and in identifying hypostasis and nature, they put particular emphasis on the manifest distinction between the two natures in Christ.[5]

At Alexandria then, the hypostasis was the autonomous subject of attribution—what we now call the person—the complete and individualized nature; while at Antioch they spoke of the hypostasis as the nature of the substance, characterized by specific qualities. This difference in terminology was in good part the cause of the violent opposition generated against Cyril's "Twelve Anathemas" on the part of the Antiochene theologians. It figures prominently in the two refutations composed at the request of Bishop John of Antioch by his two supporters, Andrew of Samosata and Theodoret of Cyr.[6]

[3] Cyril believed this phrase was taken from the *De Incarnatione* of St. Athanasius; but it really belonged to the *De Incarnatione ad Jovinium* whose author was the condemned Apollinaris of Laodicea (*MPG*, XXVIII, 256, 30). Cf. G. Voisin, *L'Apollinarisme* (Louvain, 1901), pp. 295 ff.

[4] Cf. Manoir, *op. cit.*, pp. 132 f.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 504 ff.

[6] These two works are known mainly through Cyril's refutation. Cf. J. Mahé, "Les anathématismes de S. Cyrille et les évêques orientaux," *RHE*, VII (1906), 505-48.

Actually, however, in regard to the doctrine itself, there was substantial agreement between the two schools. They agreed on a unity in the Son of God of the two natures without confusion, admixture, or change of any kind whatever. The Son of God, having assumed a human nature of the Virgin Mary, could and did act as both God and man interchangeably. However, the eastern bishops accentuated the perfect integrity of the composite, insisting upon the distinction of the two natures, while Cyril and his followers, with Athanasius in mind, and intent upon refuting Nestorianism, harped upon the substantial unity of the incarnate Word.

Meanwhile Rome, in the persons first of Pope Celestine and then of Leo, had kept itself abreast of the doctrinal valuations involved in the controversy, and in particular, of the essence of the truly orthodox position. At the instigation of Leo, while still a deacon, John Cassian had been encouraged to compose his treatise *On the Incarnation*, and a group of letters from Cyril and the eastern bishops, as well as a collection of patristic texts bearing on the Incarnation, were kept handy for the further informative use of the Papal curia.[7]

Meanwhile, too, in the East basic agreement had been achieved by Cyril's acceptance of a profession of faith sent him by John of Antioch. Actually, this formula was the profession of faith sent, in the midst of the fracas at Ephesus, by the Antiochene bishops to the Emperor Theodosius as an explanation of their position. This formula was accepted verbatim by St. Cyril and incorporated in an encyclical letter entitled *Laetentur coeli*, wherein he announced the good news of peace and unity to all the world.[8]

However, Cyril's capitulation was not accepted whole-heartedly by all his followers. He had to justify his position among the more ardent of his partisans; in particular by letters to Acacius of Myletene, to Eulogius at Constantinople, to Valerian of Iconium, and to Succensus of Diocaesarea in Isauria. For all this, he was still victim of attacks on the part of a synod held in Anazarbia, late in 433, where the Bishops of Cilicia II repudiated his "Twelve Anathemas." He met invincible opposition on the part

[7]Cf. L. Saltet, "Les sources de l'Eranistes de Theodoret.", *RHE*, VI (1905), 290-307; also T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), pp. 34 and 282 ff.

[8] Cf. Jalland, *St. Leo*, pp. 204 ff.; H. Manoir, *S. Cyrille*, pp. 141 f.

of Alexander of Hierapolis and Helladas of Tarsus. But gradually, under the calming influence of Acacius of Berytus and of John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyr was persuaded to accept Cyril's concessions, and the majority of the eastern bishops came into line.[9]

By 435, peace had been restored. But it was an uneasy peace. It was troubled in particular by a campaign of infamy waged against the reputations of the deceased Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus. In Edessa, the writings of both these men were alleged to favor an Apollinarist if not a Nestorian approach to the Incarnation; and they were further impugned by the bishops of Cilicia and Armenia. Finally on the front of ecclesiastical politics, rivalry for control of the eastern church caused antagonism among Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, with the patriarchs of the first two sees keeping a steady ear to the ground for possible "ins" at the imperial court, as well as opportunities for interfering in the provincial doings of suffragan sees all over the East.[10]

IMMEDIATE PRELIMINARIES

It was with this as a background that in 447 rumblings began to be heard involving a new heresy concerning the two natures in Christ. Rumor traced the origin of this heterodox belief to a pious, aged monk named Eutyches, archimandrite of the Monastery of Job in the environs of Constantinople, and spiritual godfather to the Eunuch Chrysaphius, at the moment a main-stay of the Emperor Theodosius II.

The theological question was brought to a head by the appearance, later in that same year, 447, of Theodoret of Cyr's *Eranistes*, a dialogue in three sections wherein an orthodox interlocutor accuses the heterodox "Beggar" of confusing the two natures in Christ, and of therefore (1) predicating changeability of God; (2) intermixing and confounding the unity in Christ of the human and divine natures; and (3) professing that the human nature of Christ was absorbed in the divine nature.[11] Theodoret had care-

[9] Cf. Manoir, *ibid.*, p. 508.

[10] Cf. R. Devreesse, "Après le Concile d'Ephese," *Echos d'Orient*, XXX (1930), 271-92; Jalland, *St. Leo*, pp. 205-14.

[11] *MPG*, LXXXIII, 27-318; cf. L. Saltet, "Les sources de l'Eranistes de Theodoret," *RHE*, VI (1905), 290-303; 513-36.

fully avoided immediate, personal references, merely indicating the nature of the heresy being bruited about. But Bishop Domnus of Antioch decided to place the blame where it belonged, and in a letter to the Emperor Theodosius, he openly accused Eutyches of the new heresy, complaining that under his influence many monks were professing a species of Apollinarism.[12]

In a counter move, with the encouragement of the imperial court, Eutyches himself addressed a letter to Pope Leo in Rome, as well as to several other patriarchs, denouncing the activities of certain "Nestorians" who, he intimated, were setting a wave of persecution in motion against himself. This letter was answered by the Pope on June 1, 448, praising the zeal of the correspondent, but expressing himself too poorly informed about the matter to be able to render judgment. Meanwhile, the imperial power moved in on the situation, deposing Bishop Irenaeus of Tyre on the charge that he had been a personal friend of Nestorius, and ordering Bishop Theodoret of Cyr confined to his own diocese because of his acknowledged opposition to the teaching of Eutyches.

Finally, on Nov. 8, 448, in a small, local synod of Bishops gathered round Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, Bishop Eusebius of Doryleum took the floor to read a long memorandum on the subject of current heresy. He named Eutyches explicity as the fomenter of a new monophysitic teaching and delated him to the council for judgment. The accusation caused consternation. But Eusebius insisted, with the result that on Nov. 12, Eutyches was formally summoned before the synod. In preparation for his appearance, the teaching of St. Cyril in his letters to Bishop John of Antioch and to Nestorius were read to the assembly, and a manifesto was sent to the emperor informing him of the synod's proceedings.[13]

Despite the archimandrite's reluctance to appear, and the evident interest of the imperial government in his protection, Eutyches was condemned by the synod and deposed.[14] He naturally

[12] Cf. Jalland, *St. Leo*, pp. 212 f.

[13] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 214 ff. The minutes of this session at Constantinople were read in the first session at Chalcedon. See E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (Leipzig, 1930-36), II, III, 77 ff. Hereafter to be referred to as *ACO*.

[14] *ACO*, *loc. cit.*, p. 128. Cf. E. Schwartz, "Der Prozess des Eutyches," *Sitzungsberichte der Bay. Akad. der Wiss.*, fasc. 7 (Munich, 1929), pp.

made wide appeal against his condemnation, enlisting among others, Dioscorus, the archbishop of Alexandria, on his side. Despite papal approbation of his deposition, the imperial authority was able to force the summoning of a council at Ephesus in August, 449, which, by the emperor's maneuvering, was presided over by the archbishop of Alexandria. The results of this council were prepared in advance. Eutyches was exonerated, Bishop Flavian was deposed and exiled for having condemned the archimandrite the year previously, and Theodoret of Cyr, Domnus of Antioch, Eusebius of Doryleum, and Ibas of Edessa were all likewise excommunicated. All this, despite the presence of papal legates, whose protests were tossed aside, along with Pope Leo's famous "Tome" which had been prepared specially to settle the matter of the Faith in the Incarnation in preparation for this gathering. The result was that Leo abrogated this assembly's doings, referring to it explicitly as *"illud Ephisenum non judicium sed latrocinium."*[15]

Fortunately for the cause of orthodoxy, the Emperor Theodosius died in July, 450, and was replaced by Marcian and Pulcheria, who immediately made peace with Rome and inaugurated preparations for a new Council, originally scheduled for Nicea on Oct. 1, 451. The Pope somewhat reluctantly agreed to the calling of this Council, dispatching new legates, and redirecting his Tome to the new Council, with the instruction that it was to be taken as the statement of Catholic belief in the Incarnation. He also fortified the Tome with a series of patristic quotations.[16]

THE TESTIMONY OF EUTYCHES

Because of administrative difficulties, the Fourth General Council was finally able to open only on Oct. 8, and its site had to be

---

1-93; and J. Draguet, "La Christologie d'Eutyches," *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 441-57.

[15] Cf. Jalland, *St. Leo*, pp. 237-53.

[16] Leo's Tome, originally dispatched on June 13, 449, was translated into Greek under the direction of the Empress Pulcheria sometime in 450 (Gr. ed. *ACO*, II, I, 10-25; cf. *ibid.*, praef. xiv-xvi). The patristic florilegium was added when it was sent a second time to Constantinople, on July 16, 450, and is the same as the selection appended to Leo's *Ep. 165* (ed. *ACO*, II, IV, 113-31). The Latin edition of the Tome is in *ACO*, II, V, ii, 24-33.

changed to Chalcedon, a small town on the Bosphorus immediately overlooking Constantinople. But the five hundred and fifty bishops, all from the provinces of the East, were immediately faced with the problems raised by the "Robber Council of Ephesus" of 449 and its predecessor, the Synod of Constantinople, of November, 448. The first session, an interminably long sitting, busied itself with the minutes of the "Robber Council," and was thus forced into reading back into the *acta* of the synod of 448, once it was decided that Dioscorus and his associates at Ephesus were to be considered the accused, and Eusebius of Doryleum, Theodoret of Cyr, and their party, including the memory of Flavian, were to be given a favorable hearing.[17]

From a strictly theological viewpoint, the focal point in the minutes of both the "Robber Council" and the previous synod of 448 was the testimony of Eutyches before the latter assembly. The archimandrite had, as was well known, several times refused to appear before that body, and had sent word through the Council's legates that his faith "conformed to the teaching of the Fathers at Nicaea and at Ephesus." However, he went on to say, "if it happened that they [the Fathers] erred or were mistaken in any respect, he neither reprehended nor accepted them, but adhered strictly to his reading of the Scriptures which were more trustworthy than the explanations of the Fathers." He further informed the synod that he believed that "after the incarnation of the Word God, that is, after the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, he adored one nature, that of the incarnate God become man." He denied outrightly that he had ever said that "God the Word had brought his flesh with him from heaven." But, he concluded, the fact that "our Lord Jesus Christ was of two natures united according to his hypostasis," he had neither learned in the explanation of the Fathers, nor did he hold this now, even if anyone should say he did, because the divine Scriptures, as he said, were better than the doctrine of the Fathers. And so saying, he confessed that "He who was born of the Virgin Mary was perfect God and perfect man, but not having flesh consubstantial with ours." Announced in the synod, this profession of the aged archimandrite gave further weight to the charges laid against him by

[17] The minutes of this session are edited in *ACO*, II, III, 27-259 (the Latin version of which will be referred to here for convenience).

Eusebius of Doryleum. Hence great pressure was exerted to bring him before the assembly.[18]

Finally, on Nov. 22, 448, Eutyches had capitulated, and arrived for the seventh session accompanied by an imperial guard and the ex-Consul and patrician Florentius, deputed by the Emperor to protect the archimandrite's interests. Immediately preceding his arrival, Flavian, the archbishop of Constantinople gave a formula of the synod's belief in the incarnation which stated: "that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, perfect God and perfect man, of a rational soul and a body, begotten before the whole universe of the Father without beginning in his Godhead, now, in these latter times, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary as to His humanity; consubstantial with the Father in His divinity, and consubstantial with his mother in His humanity. For we confess that Christ is of two natures after the incarnation, acknowledging in one subsistence and in one person, one Christ, one Lord, one Son."[19] This profession was accepted by the assembled bishops with a few modifications. Bishops Basil of Seleucia and Seleucus of Amasia made a precision to the effect that they adored "one Lord Jesus Christ in two natures." And Julian of Chios, the papal apocrisiarius in Constantinople, concurred: "We therefore confess two natures in one person, and therefore one Son, one Lord, Jesus Christ."

With this as a background, Eutyches was admitted to the synod and brought face to face with his accuser, Bishop Eusebius of Doryleum. The latter's accusation against the archimandrite was now reread to the assembly, followed by the profession of faith of the Oriental bishops, incorporated in Cyril's letter to John of Antioch in January, 433. Whereupon Eusebius interposed: "This man does not acknowledge this [doctrine] nor does he agree with it."

[18] *ACO*, II, III, 67 ff.

[19] Flavian's profession of faith read: "sapimus quia dominus noster Jesus Christus filius dei unigenitus, deus perfectus et homo perfectus est ex anima rationali et corpore, ante omnia quidem et in novissimis temporibus idem ipse propter nostram salutem de Maria virgine natus secundum humanitatem, consubstantialis patri secundum deitatem et consubstantialis matri secundum humanitatem. Etenim ex duabus naturis confitemur Christum esse post incarnationem, in una subsistentia et in una persona, unum Christum, unum dominum, unum filium confitentes" (*ACO*, II, III, 92 ff.).

Florentius, the imperial count, then stipulated that Eutyches should be interrogated regarding this matter. But Eusebius objected that the full accusation should first be heard, since he feared that the archimandrite might now change over to the true doctrine, whereas his charges were based on his previous statements and activities.

Flavian, the archbishop presiding, tried to re-assure Eusebius that the synod took into full account the basis of his accusation, but the Bishop of Doryleum blurted out: "I fear his double-dealing. For I am poor and possess nothing; and I have been threatened with exile. But this man has much money . . . and as I said, I am not interested in a present confession on his part. I have complained about his not believing correctly from what he has said and done before. . . ."[20] Turning to the archimandrite, Eusebius then asked: "Does he now agree to what has just been read from St. Cyril, and does he confess a union of two natures made in one person and in one subsistence, or not?"

Eutyches answered: "Yes, of two natures."

Eusebius: "Do you profess two natures after the incarnation, and admit that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh, or not?"

Eutyches (addressing Flavian): "I have not come here to dispute, but I have come to tell your sanctity what I hold. Here in this paper is written what I think. Order it to be read."

Flavian: "Read it yourself."

Eutyches: "I cannot."

Flavian: "Why not? Is this not your own explanation, or is it someone else's? If it is yours, read it yourself."

Eutyches: "I dictated it, and it is the same as that of the holy Fathers."

Flavian: "Well, then, tell us which Fathers, yourself. What need have you of a paper?"

Eutyches: "So do I believe: I adore the Father with the Son, and the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit together with

[20] *ACO*, II, III, 100 ff. It is clear that Eusebius lost his head at this turn of affairs, thus giving occasion for the later complaint of Eutyches (at the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus in 449) that his condemnation at Constantinople was a foregone conclusion.

the Father and the Son. I confess likewise His presentation made of flesh of the Blessed Virgin and perfectly incarnate for our salvation."

Flavian: "Do you confess that He is consubstantial with the Father in His divinity, and consubstantial with the mother in His humanity, this same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ?"

Eutyches: "Because you ordered me to do so, I have told you what I believe concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Do not ask me anything further."

Flavian: "But do you confess that Christ is of two natures?"

Eutyches: "Because I acknowledge that my God is the Lord of heaven and earth, thus far I have not allowed myself to rationalize about His nature; and I confess that thus far I have not ever said that He was consubstantial with us."

Flavian: "You do not say that He is consubstantial with the Father in His deity, and consubstantial with us in His humanity?"

Eutyches: "Until this very day I have not said that the body of our Lord and God is consubstantial with us. But I do confess that the Blessed Virgin is consubstantial with us, and that of her our God is incarnate."

Basil of Seleucia (interposing): "If the mother is consubstantial with us, so is He, as He is called the Son of Man. If the mother is consubstantial with us, then He is consubstantial with us in the flesh."

Eutyches: "Because you now say so, I will agree to all this."

Florentius: "The Son is then consubstantial with the mother, and as a consequence, consubstantial with us?"

Eutyches: "Thus far I have not said that. Because I confess a true body of God—but, mind you, I have not said that the human body is the body of God, but that there was a human body, and that the Lord is incarnate of the Virgin. If it is necessary to say consubstantial with us, of the Virgin, I also say this . . . but I will not say consubstantial, denying that He is Himself the Son of God. Until now, indeed, I have not admitted this, but believe what I have held from the beginning. But now, because your sanctity[Flavian] says this, I say it."

Flavian: "Therefore by necessity, but not through your own will, you confess the true faith?"

Eutyches: "Now, my Lord, so let it be. Until this hour I have

feared to say anything such, because I know my Lord God, and I have not allowed myself to reason concerning His nature. But as your Holiness permits this, and as you teach it, so say I."

Flavian: "We are not bringing in any novelty here. Our forefathers have explained these things; and as they explained them, so do we have the faith of them, changing nothing."[21]

The patrician Florentius intervened now, and on several instances, tried to get the old man to admit the two natures in the Incarnate Christ, but in vain. Finally he was forced to accede to the condemnation which was pronounced by Flavian and the Council of fifty-three bishops.[22]

As this testimony was being reread in the first session at Chalcedon, Dioscorus, the accused archbishop of Alexandria, was not slow to point out the inconsistencies in conduct on the part of some of the bishops, such as Basil of Seleucia, who in the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus had acquiesced in the exoneration of Eutyches, but now were once more repudiating the archimandrite. Basil hastened to defend himself, clarifying his position by explaining: "When I spoke of a union in two natures, I meant a complete humanity and a complete divinity. For Jesus Christ had the one with the Father before all eternity; He had the other of His mother according to the flesh; and taking on this latter, he united it to himself hypostatically; hence He was called the Son of God and the Son of man." This summed up fairly well the sentiment of the majority of bishops at Chalcedon, though it did not entirely please the Egyptians and the Illyrians who could see nought but the terminology and the stand of St. Cyril.

It was on account of this noticeable division that the Imperial

[21] *ACO*, II, III, 102-127. In reaction to Nestorianism, Eutyches had an inordinate fear of speaking of the human body of the Logos, lest he give the impression that there were two separate personal entities in Christ.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 128. In the "Robber Synod" of 449, however, Eutyches, appealing against this condemnation, maintained that Eusebius and Flavian had pounced upon a slip of the tongue on his part, and in accord with a previous arrangement, used this to condemn him: "accusationem ex insidiis Eusebii episcopi Dorylaei sustinui libellos dirigentis adversum me Flaviano et diversis aliis episcopis . . . haereticum iniuriose in eis vocantis . . . ut subito in altercationibus quaestionum lapsum linguae ut solet ex tumultu et novitate vocum perpessus inruerem in peccatum." (This testimony was quoted in the first session at Chalcedon: *ACO*, II, III, 71 ff.

commissioners began to press the assembly for a new definition of faith, requesting at the close of the first session that each of the bishops register in writing his faith on the doctrinal point at issue. They reminded the bishops of the Emperor's adhesion to the doctrine of Nicaea and Constantinople, as well as to the writings of Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose and Cyril—all of which had been approved by the first Council of Ephesus. Finally, they recalled for them Pope Leo's Letter to Flavian—the Tome—in which the errors of Eutyches were explicitly discussed and condemned.[23]

To offset this imperial interference, the second session of the Council was given to a review of the faith as it was contained in the Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, and in the writings of St. Cyril and in Leo's Tome.[24] Unfortunately, though Leo had perceived clearly the source of the Eutychean error—he refers explicitly to the aged monk's theological incompetence and to his stubbornness, citing his wavering testimony before Flavian's synod—and had stated the doctrinal position of the Church in unequivocal terms, he had also seen fit to develop at some length the conclusions and corrolaries of the doctrine of the two natures in Christ by launching into a paradox-studded consideration of the *Communicatio idiomatum*.[25] This brought forth three specific objections from the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops; and though the passages questioned in Leo's Tome were immediately matched with similar statements in Cyril that had been previously read to the Council, the end result was the declaration of a recess to allow the disturbed bishops to meet with Bishop Anatole of Con-

[23] *ACO*, II, III, 257 ff.

[24] *ACO*, II, III, 260-66. On the order of the sessions see Schwartz's preface, *ibid.*, 2, vi-vii. The citation at this session of the Creed of Constantinople was the first official recognition of this document that has been recorded. Cf. J. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York, 1950), pp. 296 ff.

[25] In so doing Leo was obviously attempting to please the followers of St. Cyril, for Cyril had been greatly pre-occupied with this phase of the doctrine (cf. Manoir, *S. Cyrille*, pp. 145 ff.). However, as immediately developed, Cyril's followers were not as far advanced as their master, hence found difficulty in the Pope's expressions.

stantinople and the Roman Legates to have their difficulties fully ironed out.[26]

Meanwhile however, all parties heartily agreed in the condemnation of Eutyches. His was a strange fate: he was finally rejected and condemned both by the orthodox under Pope Leo and the partisans of St. Cyril, and by the monophysitic parties that sprang up in Egypt and the Orient following the lead of Timothy Aelurus, and later Severian of Antioch.[27] Leo had struck a proper note in his Tome when he characterized the aged monk as motivated by "imprudentia hominis imperiti." For the root of the man's error was theological ignorance. His stubborn loyalty to the terminology of St. Cyril might have been commendable except for the fact that he had not the ability to understand so subtle a theologian; nor had he the desire to engage in the necessary speculation. On his own admission, his approach to the Deity prevented him from "reasoning about the nature of His God." Unfortunately too, he was victim of a literary fraud, having at the beginning of his difficulties in 448 quoted several patristic, even papal texts to Pope Leo, that apparently supported his stand, but which were actually camouflaged Apollinarist statements.[28] Finally, aged and long revered, he felt himself the victim of a great persecution; and this only strengthened his determination to adhere to his original position with the tenacity of a martyr.

It is clear from the first two sessions of the Council of Chalcedon that the condemnation of Eutyches involved many dangerous side issues and complications; there is no question but that the condemnation was just. The further theological activities of the Chalcedonian fathers made definite for all time the Church's teaching concerning the "union of the divine and the human natures in the Person of the Son of God"; the fact that this definition was

[26] *ACO*, II, III, 274 ff. Both the archdeacon Aetius and Theodoret of Cyr came to Leo's defense.

[27] Cf. J. Draguet, "Le Christologie d'Eutyches," *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 452 ff.

[28] Immediately after his condemnation at Constantinople in 448, Eutyches had addressed an appeal to the Pope which was forwarded by the Emperor (*Inter Leon, epp.* 21: *MPL*, LIV, 713 f.). To this appeal, the archimandrite appended a florilegium including citations from Popes Julian and Felix (both citations being Apollinarist frauds). Cf. Manoir, *S. Cyrille*, pp. 463 ff.; G. Voisin, *L'Apollinarisme*, pp. 214 ff.

not fully appreciated or accepted by all the factions represented at the Council is an unfortunate historical development. As will be clear from the second section of this essay, great effort was made by the assembled theologians to satisfy all the various viewpoints involved, encompassing not only St. Cyril's and Pope Leo's terminology, but giving more attention than is usually acknowledged to the strictly Oriental approach.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

New York, N. Y.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1901, by Fr. H. T. Henry, presents the original Latin and a translation of two of the poems of Pope Leo XIII in honor of the Blessed Virgin, which the Sovereign Pontiff published under the general title of *Leonis XIII in Mariam Virginam Flosculi*. . . . Continuing his series of articles on the diseases likely to cause sudden death, Dr. James J. Walsh discusses the pathology and the symptoms of pneumonia (which is fatal to from fifteen to twenty per cent of its victims, he tells us), typhoid fever, appendicitis, acute indigestion, thrombosis, tetanus and hydrophobia. He emphasizes especially the danger of sudden death in the case of alcoholic patients. . . . Fr. J. Daley concludes his interesting and edifying narrative of the martyrdom of the two brothers, Bishops de la Rochefoucald, who were put to death, together with a large number of priests, in the massacre *des Carmes* at the time of the French Revolution. . . . Fr. J. Dolan, of Ardee, Ireland, describes the cathedral of Armagh, begun in 1840 and completed in 1893. Much of the financial burden of this magnificent structure was borne by American Catholics. . . . Fr. W. Stang, of Providence, gives an account of the first national congress of missionaries to non-Catholics, conducted at Winchester, Tennessee, under the auspices of the Paulist Fathers. . . . In the Conference section we are told that white caskets are not suitable for adults, although there is no specific decree of the Church on the subject. . . . The question is asked whether Benediction may be given to a religious community when there are fewer than twenty-five persons in the chapel, and that answer is that when the community has the right to Benediction in their chapel "there need be no question as to the number of persons present, provided the service can be conducted with the solemnity and observance of the rubrics—chant, servers, etc."

F. J. C.

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION *MUNIFICENTISSIMUS DEUS* AND OUR BLESSED LADY'S COREDEMPTION

The Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* (Nov. 1, 1950) in which Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII solemnly defines Our Blessed Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven, will take its place in history as one of the most notable papal documents in modern times. This is not the hasty and superficial appraisal of an enthusiast, but rather the sober verdict of those who have carefully weighed and analyzed the Constitution's theological contents. Nor is a penetrating scrutiny of the document necessary to perceive its manifold theological implications; a mere perusal of the text could hardly fail to reveal its significance for those whose profession it is to study and to teach the sacred sciences. For example, the Holy Father's well-defined position on what constitutes a "tradition" sufficiently genuine to warrant a dogmatic pronouncement; his oft-repeated emphasis on the authority of the Magisterium as the supreme rule of faith; his practical and very timely lesson on the correct use of positive and speculative theology, on the methodology to be followed in the process of scientific investigation; all these and various other salient points in the encyclical are obviously of capital importance to the theologian and we may rightly expect them to shed considerable light on future discussions concerning other phases of the sacred discipline.

But it is not the scope of this paper to cull the many theological gems scattered throughout the recent Constitution; much less are we to undertake a systematic evaluation of its various doctrinal contents.[1] As the title of this essay indicates, we now propose to

[1] The reader may consult the following scholarly articles: Most Rev. John J. Wright, Bishop of Worcester, "The Dogma of the Assumption," *AER*, CXXIV, 2 (Feb. 1951), 81-96; A. Bea, S.J., "La Sacra Scrittura 'ultimo fondamento' del domma dell'Assunzione," *Civiltà Cattolica*, a. 101, IV (1950), 547-61; J. Filograssi, S.J., "Constitutio Apostolica 'Munificentissimus Deus' (1 novembris, 1950)," *Gregorianum*, XXXI (1950), 483-525; J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., "La bulle dogmatique 'Munificentissimus Deus' (1 nov. 1950)," *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, I (1951), 89-130; George Bissonnette, A. A., "The Twelfth Chapter of the Apocalypse and Our Lady's Assumption," *Marian Studies*, II (1951), 170-77.

contribute a few pertinent observations on the teaching of *Munificentissimus Deus* concerning Our Blessed Lady's Coredemption. Our paper will be divided into three sections of unequal length and importance: (I) the arguments from Mary's Coredemption in favor of her Assumption; (II) the various opinions of Catholic theologians on the value of the argument; and (III) confirmation of the argument in the new Constitution.

I. FORMULATION OF THE ARGUMENT

The argument from Mary's Coredemption in favor of the Assumption may, of course, be formulated in various ways. In the March, 1948, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* we presented the syllogism in these words: "The manner in which Christ fulfilled His office as Redeemer of the human race was precisely by obtaining a *complete* and *total* victory over the devil and his dominion; which victory culminated in His anticipated glorious resurrection. Now, Our Blessed Lady, being the Coredemptrix of mankind, shared Christ's identical victory over the devil and his dominion. Therefore, she, too, enjoyed the privilege of an anticipated glorious resurrection."[2]

The cogency of the syllogism hinges on the *identity* of Christ's and Mary's *total* victory over Satan. However, since Mary's intimate share in the Redeemer's victory is necessarily implied in her role as New Eve or Coredemptrix, and since this association between Mother and Son is strikingly foretold in Genesis 3:15 and fully endorsed by Tradition, it is quite understandable that the above syllogism (or its equivalent) is used by not a few as an *argumentum ex Coredemptione*, by many as an *argumentum ex S. Scriptura*, and again by others as an *argumentum ex Traditione de Secunda Eva*. This variety of presentation does not necessarily affect the inner structure of the syllogism. Regardless of the elements (biblical or traditional) specifically stressed in the premises, the argument not only leads to the same conclusion, but also—at least in most cases—follows the same process to reach that conclusion.

As to the major of our syllogism, we pointed out that it was quite clearly contained in Sacred Scripture, particularly in the

[2] J. B. Carol, O.F.M., "The Definability of Mary's Assumption," *AER*, CXVIII, 3 March 1948), 171.

epistles of Saint Paul (cf. *Col.* 2:14-15; *Heb.* 2:14; *Rom.* 6:9; 4:25; *I Cor.* 15:17).[3]

In order to establish the minor premise we argued from the Protoevangelium (*Gen.* 3:15), and from the Magisterium, specifically from Pius IX's Constitution *Ineffabilis Deus* and from a considerable number of petitions addressed to the Holy See by Catholic Bishops urging the definition of the Assumption.[4] From these sources we endeavored to show both that Mary is the "woman" foretold in the first messianic prophecy[5] and that she is therein signified as intimately sharing her Son's redemptive mission; hence, as sharing His total victory over Satan.

II. VARIOUS OPINIONS ON THE VALUE OF THE ARGUMENT

While expressing our personal preferences in the article referred to, we were fully aware of the fact that our views would not appeal to all. We knew, for example, of the open hostility manifested in this connection by Msgr. E. Nácar according to whom our argument is "exegetically preposterous."[6] A similar, though less emphatic, criticism was voiced more recently by Professor B. Altaner, of Munich, who on the very eve of the papal pronouncement undertook to prove that neither our argument nor any other argument would justify an *ex cathedra* definition of Mary's Assumption.[7]

[3] *Art. cit.*, pp. 171 f.

[4] *Art. cit.*, pp. 172-75.

[5] We hold, with many exegetes and theologians, that the "woman" mentioned in *Gen.* 3:15 is Mary *sensu litterali*. However, the argument in the text does not depend on this view. Some of those who argue from the Protoevangelium in favor of the Assumption adhere to the typical sense. On the other hand, some of those who hold the literal interpretation refuse to see Mary's prerogative contained in that passage.

[6] Cf. E. Nácar, in the preface to Garcia Castro's brochure *El dogma de la Asunción* (Madrid, 1947), p. 8. An excellent refutation of Nácar's statements was written by the Spanish exegete J. M. Bover, S.J., "Una censura de la interpretación mariológica del Protoevangelio," *Estudios eclesiásticos*, XXI (1947), 479-86. In this connection we refer to the recent article by A. Colunga, O.P., "La Madre del Mesías en el Antiguo Testamento," *La Ciencia tomista*, LXXVII (1950), 68-83, in which the author claims (pp. 74 f.) that the Protoevangelium may be interpreted of Our Lady only *sensu accommodatitio*.

[7] B. Altaner, "Zur Frage der Definibilität der Assumptio B.M.V.," *Theologische Revue*, XLV (1949), 131 ff. Altaner has been refuted by J. Filograssi, S.J., in his article "Theologia Catholica et Assumptio B.V.M.,"

Another group of theologians is willing to admit the value of the argument in question, but with certain reservations. Thus, for example, Fr. A. Malo, O.F.M., is of the opinion that Our Lady's threefold victory over Satan is not contained in Sacred Scripture but in Tradition. Nevertheless, he points out, viewed in the light of the ecclesiastical Magisterium and tradition, the argument is "unassailable" and does lead us to an apodictic conclusion.[8] A somewhat similar stand was taken at the recent Marian Congress of Le Puy by the eminent French theologian, J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M. According to him, the argument based on the Coredemptrix's complete triumph over Satan is not biblical but theological. Bonnefoy is an ardent advocate of Mary's Coredemption and also of the theory that the "woman" mentioned in Genesis 3:15 is Mary in a literal sense,[9] but he contends that the struggle between the woman and the serpent, as predicted in that prophecy, does not lead to Mary's Assumption by way of simple analysis, but by means of a deduction. In other words, Mary's Assumption has *only a foundation* in the Protoevangelium; and since Mary is therein predicted as a Coredemptrix, we may say that the Assumption is *virtually* revealed in that prerogative.[10]

Gregorianum, XXXI (1950), 323-60. Cf. also G. Philips, "Quelques publications récentes autour du problème de l'Assomption," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, XXVI (1950), pp. 11-18.

[8] A. Malo, O.F.M., "La Bible et l'Assomption," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), 113 f. Cf. also B. H. Merkelbach, *Mariologia* (Paris, 1939), 274-75, 280, 283, 285, 289; A. Charbel, S.D.B., "A Assunção de Nossa Senhora e o Antigo Testamento," *Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, X (1950), 42 f.; J. Coppens, "Le protévangile. Un nouvel essai d'exégèse," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, XXVI (1950), 5-36. Elsewhere, however, Coppens admits the value of the arguments taken from Mary's Coredemption in favor of the Assumption. Cf. "La définibilité de l'Assomption," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, XXIII (1947), 24 f.

[9] J. F. Bonnefoy, *Le Mystère de Marie selon le Protévangile et l'Apocalypse* (Paris, 1949), pp. 24-33.

[10] Cf. his article "Définibilité de l'Assomption," *Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay* (Paris, 1950), 220 ff.; likewise "La Bulle dogmatique 'Munificentissimus Deus' (1 nov. 1950)," *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, I (1951), 124 ff. This view is shared by E. Esteve, O.Carm., "La Asunción corporal y los principios de la Mariología," *Estudios Marianos*, VI (1947), 229 f., 233. G. Philips in his "Autour de la définibilité d'un dogme," *Marianum*, X (1948), 107 ff., seems to draw the Assumption from the Coredemption, but judging from what he says elsewhere (*Marianum*, XI, 44), he does not consider this a *biblical* argument.

According to M. Jugie, A.A., the doctrine of Mary's Coredemption is *de fide ex ordinario Magisterio,*[11] and is clearly insinuated (*clairement insinuée*) in Genesis 3:15.[12] However, he points out that this is only an *argumentum convenientiae* in favor of the Assumption.[13] More recently the same author has stated that the Assumption might be *deduced* from the Protoevangelium.[14]

Nevertheless, by far the greater number of theologians, particularly in the last few decades, would seem to favor the view that Our Lady's Assumption is *formally implicitly revealed* in the Coredemptrix's complete victory over Satan as foretold in Genesis 3:15. Unfortunately, the terminology used in this connection is not always uniform and clear, but the argument seems to amount to substantially the same thing. From among the many names which could easily be brought forward under this heading, we select the following at random: R. Buselli, O.F.M.,[15] A. Vaccari, O.S.B.,[16] D. Arnaldi,[17] A. Lana,[18] M. J. Scheeben,[19] A. Jannucci,[20] G. Perrella,[21] R. de la Broise, S.J.,[22] B. Gargiulo,

[11] M. Jugie, *La mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge; étude historico-doctrinale* (Vatican City, 1944), p. 647.

[12] *Op. cit.*, pp. 542 f.

[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 684. This view is shared also by M. M. Cuervo López, O.P., in his "Definibilidad de la Asunción de María a los cielos," *Ciencia tomista,* LXXVII (1950), 191.

[14] M. Jugie, "Assomption de la Sainte Vierge," *Maria; études sur la Sainte Vierge* (ed. H. du Manoir, S.J.), I (Paris, 1949), 631.

[15] R. Buselli, O.F.M., *La Vergine Maria vivente in corpo ed in anima in cielo, ossia apparecchio teologico-storico-critico sulla definibilità dommatica della corporea Assunzione della Madre di Dio, secondo il beneplacito della Cattolica Chiesa* (Florence, 1863), 63 ff.

[16] A. Vaccari, O.S.B., *De corporea Deiparae Assumptione in coelum an dogmatico decreto definiri possit disquisitio historico-critico-theologica* (Rome, 1869), 342.

[17] D. Arnaldi, *Note illustrative sul Transito di Maria Santissima, Immacolata Vergine, Madre di Dio* (Acqui, 1880), 135 ff. The author carries the argument to the extreme of denying Mary's death. Cf. G. Ameri, O.F.M., "La dottrina di Domenico Arnaldi sull'Assunzione della Beata Vergine Maria," *Marianum,* XII (1950), 82 ff.

[18] A. Lana, *La resurrezione e corporea Assunzione al cielo della S. Vergine Madre di Dio* (Rome, 1880), 144 f.

[19] M. J. Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik,* II (Freiburg, 1882), 581, 583 f.

[20] A. Jannucci, *De psychosomatica et pneumasomatica Deiparentis Assumptione* (Turin, 1884), pp. 130, 233.

O.F.M.Cap.,[23] J. B. Terrien, S.J.,[24] P. Renaudin, O.S.B.,[25] L. Janssens, O.S.B.,[26] C. van Crombrugghe,[27] F. X. Godts, C.SS.R.,[28] J. Agusti, C.M.F.,[29] C. M. Cervetti,[30] G. Mattiusi,[31] A. Barros Errazuris,[32] R. O'Connell, S.J.,[33] A. Fernández Nistal,[34] F. S. Müller, S.J.,[35] C. Vidal,[36] C. Friethoff, O.P.,[37] T. de Orbiso,

---

[21] G. Perrella, *Quaestio utrum Beata Virgo non solum in anima sed etiam in corpore evecta fuerit in coelum* (Naples, 1901), pp. 17 ff.

[22] R. de la Broise, S.J., in *Études*, XCI (1902), 605; cf. L. Carli, "La definibilità dommatica dell'Assunzione di Maria," *Marianum*, VII (1945), 66. For Carli's own views, cf. p. 76.

[23] G. Gargiulo, O.F.M.Cap., *La corporea Assunzione di Maria al cielo. Tradizione e scuola Francescana* (Naples, 1902), pp. 17 f.

[24] J. B. Terrien, S.J., *La Mère de Dieu, II* (Paris, 1902), 347 ff.

[25] P. Renaudin, O.S.B., "La mission de Corédemptrice et la définibilité de l'Assomption," *Revue thomiste*, XII (1904), 533-46; XIII (1905), 400-417; XIV (1906), 337-53. *Id., L'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge; exposé et histoire* (Paris, 1908), pp. 50 ff. *Id., Assumptio Beatae Mariae Virginis Matris Dei; disquisitio theologica* (Turin-Rome, 1933), pp. 107 ff.

[26] L. Janssens, O.S.B., *Summa theologica*, V. *Tractatus de Deo Homine*, 2da pars: *Mariologia-Soteriologia* (Friburg-im-Breisgou, 1902), 945 ff.

[27] C. van Crombrugghe, *Tractatus de Beata Maria Virgine* (Ghent, 1913), pp. 175 f.

[28] F. X. Godts, C.SS.R., *Définibilité dogmatique de l'Assomption corporelle de la Très-Sainte Vierge. Réfutation d'une recente brochure allemande* (Esschen, 1924), p. 65.

[29] J. Augusti Panella, C.M.F., *La Virgen en el Misterio de la Asunción* (Madrid, 1931), pp. 351 ff.

[30] C. M. Cervetti, *La Asunción de la Santísima Virgen en cuerpo y alma al cielo* (Santiago de Chile, 1922), p. 9.

[31] G. Mattiusi, *L'Assunzione corporea della Vergine Madre di Dio nel dogma cattolico* (Milan, 1924), pp. 176 ff.

[32] A. Barros Errázuris, "Fundamentos teológicos de la doctrina de la Asunción corporal de la Santísima Virgen a los cielos," *Crónica Oficial del Congreso Mariano hispano-americano de Sevilla* (Madrid, 1930), p. 514.

[33] R. O'Connell, S.J., *Mary's Assumption* (New York, 1930), pp. 119 ff.

[34] A. Fernández Nistal, in *Crónica Oficial del Congreso Mariano hispano-americano de Sevilla* (Madrid, 1930), pp. 205, 211.

[35] F. S. Müller, S.J., *Origo divino-apostolica doctrinae evectionis Beatissimae Virginis ad gloriam coelestem quoad corpus* (Innsbruck, 1930), 32-69.

[36] Clemente Vidal, "Definibilidad de la Asunción de la Santísima Virgen," *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, XIV (1936), 763-72.

[37] C. Friethoff, O.P., *De Alma Socia Christi Mediatoris* (Rome, 1936), pp. 156-70. Cf. also his "De doctrina Assumptionis corporalis B. M. Virginis rationibus theologicis illustrata," *Angelicum*, XV (1938), 9.

O.F.M.Cap.,[38] L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv.,[39] L. B. Koller, O.P.,[40] J. Duhr, S.J.,[41] A. Plessis, S.M.M.,[42] G. Alastruey,[43] G. M. Roschini, O.S.M.,[44] J. Garreta,[45] C. Balić, O.F.M.,[46] D. de Sousa, O.F.M.,[47] B. Mariani, O.F.M.,[48] A. Martini, O.F.M.,[49] L. Colomer, O.F.M.,[50] F. A. de Aldama, S.J.,[51] E. Sauras, O.P.,[52] J. M. Bover, S.J.,[53] M. Peinador, C.M.F.,[54] A. Luis, C.SS.R.,[55]

[38] Teófilo de Orbiso, O.F.M.Cap., "La Mujer del Protoevangelio," *Estudios bíblicos*, I, segunda época (1942), 285 f.

[39] L. Di Fonzo, O.M.Conv., "De Immaculatae Deiparae Assumptione post praecipua recentiora studia critica disquisitio," *Miscellanea Francescana*, XLVI (1946), 31 ff.

[40] L. B. Koller, O.P., *La définibilité dogmatique de l'Assomption* (Freiburg, 1946), 65 ff.

[41] J. Duhr, S.J., *La glorieuse Assomption de la Mère de Dieu* (Paris, 1949), pp. 108-115.

[42] A. Plessis, S.M.M., *Manuale Mariologiae dogmaticae* (Pontchateau, 1942), p. 297.

[43] G. Alastruey, *Tratado de la Virgen Santísima* (Madrid, 1947), pp. 493 f., 509.

[44] G. M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Mariologia*, II, pars 2 (Rome, 1947), 287 f.

[45] J. Garreta, *El glorioso triunfo de la Virgen María* (Barcelona, 1947), pp. 45 ff.

[46] C. Balić, O.F.M., "Vers un nouveau dogme marial," *Actas do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1948), p. 174; "Sulla definibilità dell'Assunzione della Beata Vergine," *Atti del Congresso Nazionale Mariano dei Frati Minori d'Italia* (Rome, 1948), p. 695; *Pro veritate Assumptionis B. V. Mariae dogmatice definienda* (Rome, 1949), pp. 32 f.

[47] D. de Sousa, O.F.M., "A Assunção na Sagrada Escritura," *Actas do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1948), pp. 33, 34.

[48] B. Mariani, O.F.M., "L'Assunzione di Maria SS. nella Sacra Scrittura," *Atti del Congresso Nazionale Mariano dei Frati Minori d'Italia* (Rome, 1948), pp. 477 ff.

[49] A. Martini, O.F.M., "L'Assunzione di Maria SS. e la dottrina francescana del primato assoluto di Cristo," *ibid.*, pp. 595 ff.

[50] L. Colomer, O.F.M., "La Maternidad divina y la perfecta asociación de María a Jesucristo, fundamentos de la Asunción," *Estudios Marianos*, VI (1947), 238, 254 ff.

[51] F. A. de Aldama, S.J., "La Asunción ante el Magisterio Eclesiástico. Horizontes teológicos de su definibilidad," *Estudios Marianos*, VI (1947), 319.

[52] E. Sauras, O.P., "Definibilidad de la Asunción de la Santísima Virgen," *Estudios Marianos*, VI (1947), 42 f.

[53] J. M. Bover, S.J., "La Asunción corporal de la Virgen María a los cielos en la Sagrada Escritura," *Revista española de teología*, VI (1946),

C. de Pamplona, O.F.M.Cap.,[56] L. G. da Fonseca, S.J.[57] F. Cayré, A.A.,[58] E. Longpré, O.F.M.,[59] B. Lonergan, S.J.,[60] A. Ferland, S.S.,[61] C. F. De Vine, C.SS.R.,[62] G. M. Carter,[63] R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P.,[64] K. Jüssen,[65] F. X. de Abárzuza, O.F.M.Cap.,[66] J. Ternus, S.J.,[67] T. Gallus, S.J.,[68] K. Healy, O.Carm.,[69] A. San-

---

163-83; *La Asunción de María. Tratado teológico y antología de textos* (Madrid, 1947), pp. 45-63, 267 ff.

[54] M. Peinador, C.M.F., "La Asunción de la Santísima Virgen en la Sagrada Escritura," *Estudios Marianos,* VI (1947), 61-78; "De argumento scripturistico in bulla dogmatica de Assumptione," *Ephemerides Mariologicae,* I (1951), 27-44. Unfortunately, the latter article, excellent in every respect, was unknown to us during the preparation of our own essay.

[55] A. Luis, C.SS.R., "Valoración comparativa de los argumentos con que suele probarse la Asunción," *Estudios Marianos,* VI (1947), 293-98.

[56] Crisóstomo de Pamplona, O.F.M.Cap., "La muerte de la Santísima Virgen a la luz de la Sagrada Escritura, de la tradición y de la teología," *Actas del Congreso Mariano Franciscano-Español* (Madrid, 1948), 148 f.

[57] L. G. da Fonseca, S.J., *L'Assunzione di Maria nella Sacra Scrittura* (Rome, 1948), pp. 21-37.

[58] Cayré, A. A., "L'Assomption aux quatre premiers siècles. Etat embryonnaire de la doctrine," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), pp. 129, 149.

[59] E. Longpré, O.F.M., "L'Assomption et l'Immaculée Conception," *Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay* (Paris, 1950), p. 276, n. 79.

[60] B. Lonergan, S.J., "The Assumption and Theology," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), p. 417.

[61] A. Ferland, P.S.S., "La définibilité de l'Assomption," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), pp. 364 ff.

[62] F. De Vine, C.SS.R., "The Fathers of the Church and the Assumption," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), pp. 409 ff.

[63] G. M. Carter, "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin," *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montreal, 1948), p. 431.

[64] R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., "L'Assomption est-elle formellement révélée de façon implicite?" *Doctor communis,* I (1948), 44-59. *Id., The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life* (Dublin, 1941), pp. 167 ff.

[65] K. Jüssen, *Tatsache und Definierbarkeit der leiblichen Himmelfahrt Mariens* (Karlsruhe, 1948), pp. 30 ff.

[66] F. X. ab Abarzuza, O.F.M.Cap., *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae,* II (Padre las Casas, Chile, 1949), 274, 276.

[67] J. Ternus, S.J., *Die gegenwärtige Stand der Assumptafrage* (Regensburg, 1948), pp. 44 f., 52 f.

[68] T. Gallus, S.J., "Assumptio B.M.V. ex Protoevangelio definibilis," *Divus Thomas,* XLII (1949), 121-41.

[69] K. Healy, O.Carm., "The Assumption among Mary's Privileges," *The Thomist,* XIV (1951), 87-91.

tonicola, C.SS.R.,[70] E. A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R.,[71] A. Bea, S.J.,[72] J. Filograssi, S.J.[73]

Judging from the above incomplete list, representing a variety of theological schools and nationalities, the reader may well understand why Fr. Bonnefoy himself has referred to our argument as one that has become "classical" in Catholic theology.[74] Having consulted virtually everything that has been written on the subject, both here in America and abroad, we cannot but endorse Fr. Balić's claim to the effect that "the *majority* of theologians today discover here [in the Protoevangelium]a revelation, and even a *formal* revelation, of the Assumption."[75]

III. CONFIRMATION OF THE ARGUMENT IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION

Nowhere does the *Munificentissimus Deus* state in so many words that Our Blessed Lady was assumed to the glory of heaven because she was the *Coredemptrix* of the human race. Nevertheless, while the term "Coredemptrix" is not expressly used, the document does employ certain paraphrases which are obviously equivalent. Not less than *five* times in the Constitution does the Holy Father stress the "close association" between Mary and the Redeemer; in three of these instances the reference is coupled with an allusion to Sacred Scripture.

(1) The first reference is made when the Holy Father speaks of "the wonderful harmony and order of those privileges which the most provident God has lavished upon this revered *associate of Our Redeemer. . . .*"[76]

[70] A. Santonicola, C.SS.R., *L'Assunzione di Maria e la mente di S. Alfonso* (Alba, 1950), pp. 64 ff., 111 ff., 155.

[71] E. A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R., *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting* (The Catholic Theological Society of America, 1947), pp. 91 f., 96 ff.

[72] A. Bea, S.J., "La Sacra Scrittura 'ultimo fondamento' del domma dell'Assunzione," *Civiltà cattolica*, IV (1950), 354-60.

[73] J. Filograssi, S.J., "Constitutio Apostolica 'Munificentissimus Deus' (1 nov. 1950)," *Gregorianum*, XXXI (1950), 511 ff., 525.

[74] J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., "Le Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay," *Marie*, IV, 1 (1950), 34.

[75] C. Balić, O.F.M., "Vers un nouveau dogme marial," *Acta do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1948), p. 170.

[76] We have used the English translation prepared by the Rev. Dr. Joseph C. Fenton and published in *The Thomist*, XIV (1951), 3-21. Cf. p. 8.

(2) The second is given in connection with the teaching of the Scholastics who "base the strength of their proof on the incomparable dignity of her divine motherhood and of all those prerogatives which follow from it. These include her exalted holiness . . . *the intimate union of Mary with her Son. . . .*"[77] Immediately preceding this paragraph is the statement that this privilege is in wonderful accord with those divine truths given us in Holy Scripture."

(3) The third allusion is found after a lengthy exposition of the teaching of tradition on Mary's Assumption, and it reads: "All these proofs and considerations of the holy Fathers and theologians are based upon the Sacred Writings as their ultimate foundation. These set the revered Mother of God as it were before our very eyes as *most intimately joined to her divine Son and as always sharing His lot.*"[78]

(4) The fourth and most significant reference is worded as follows: "We must remember *especially* that, since the second century, the Virgin Mary has been designated by the holy Fathers as the new Eve, who, although subject to the new Adam, is *most intimately associated with Him* in that struggle against the infernal foe which, as foretold in the Protoevengelium (*Gen.* 3:15), finally resulted in that most complete victory over the sin and death which are always mentioned together in the writings of the Apostle of the Gentiles (*Rom.* 5-6; *I Cor.* 15:21-26, 54-57). Consequently, just as the glorious Resurrection of Christ was an *essential* part and final sign of this victory, so that struggle which was *common to the Blessed Virgin and her divine Son* should be brought to a close by the glorification of her virginal body, for the same Apostle says: 'When this mortal thing hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory.' "[79]

(5) The fifth and last reference, which immediately follows the words given above, reads: "Hence, the revered Mother of God, from all eternity joined in a hidden way with Jesus Christ in one and the same decree of predestination (Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*), immaculate in her conception, a most perfect virgin in her divine motherhood, *the noble associate of the divine Redeemer* who has

[77] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 12 f.
[78] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[79] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 18 f.

won a complete triumph over sin and its consequences, was finally granted, as the supreme culmination of her privileges, that she should be preserved free from the corruption of the tomb and that, like her own Son, having overcome death, she might be taken up body and soul to the glory of heaven. . . ."[80]

We note, first of all, that in these five instances the Holy Father speaks of Mary's "association with Christ" as being a distinct prerogative of hers, a prerogative which, though closely related to her other titles, is nevertheless different from them. In what and for what purpose is Mary "intimately associated" with Christ? Obviously, in His office as Redeemer and for the purpose of overthrowing Satan's empire. If Mary's association did not mean just that, it could hardly be advanced as an argument in favor of her Assumption. Besides, according to the Holy Father, Mary is associated with Christ in her official capacity as "the New Eve." This latter expression is understood by Catholic tradition to mean that just as the first Eve had co-operated with Adam in bringing about the original prevarication, so Mary was destined to co-operate with the New Adam, Christ, in the work of redeeming the world from the original Fall. Hence, the expression "New Eve" is used in Catholic theology as synonymous with "Coredemptrix." Pius XII himself understands it in this sense when he writes: "Are not Jesus and Mary the two sublime loves of the Christian people? Are they not the new Adam and the new Eve whom the tree of the Cross unites in sorrow and in love *to offer reparation for the guilt of our first parents in Eden?*"[81] And in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* the same Pontiff styles Mary "New Eve" inasmuch as, on Calvary's height, she offered a sacrifice in order to expiate the sins of the world together with the Redeemer.[82]

There are three things in particular which the Apostolic Constitution affirms in connection with this role of Mary as the New Eve or Coredemptrix: its relation to Mary's Assumption; its traditional character; its biblical origin. Let us examine each of these questions briefly.

[80] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[81] Cf. *L'Osservatore romano*, April 22-23, 1940.

[82] Cf. *Acta apostolicae sedis*, XXXV (1943), 247. Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., Mary's Coredemption in the Teaching of Pope Pius XII," *AER*, CXXI, 4 (Oct. 1949), 353-61.

(1) In what sense does the role of New Eve or Coredemptrix imply Mary's bodily glorification? What is the exact relation between these two prerogatives? Before the definition of November 1, it was quite commonly held that Our Lady's Assumption was formally implicitly contained in the more generic doctrine concerning her intimate association with Christ in the latter's complete victory over Satan. It was believed, in other words, that Mary's triumph over death was but an essential part or aspect of her complete victory over the devil. Hence, if the latter was revealed, so was the former.

This view, however, was not fully shared by all. Fr. J. F. Bonnefoy, for example, expressed the opinion that when we speak of the Coredemptrix's victory over sin and death we are dealing with "metaphorical formulae," from which it is difficult to draw clear and definite conclusions as to the nature and extent of Mary's triumph. He pointed out, for instance, that if from the nature of Christ's victory over sin we try to infer the nature of His victory over death, we would have to conclude that He did not die at all. He further drew our attention to the fact that on the day of the general resurrection *all* the just will completely triumph over death. Hence, this privilege is not exclusively Mary's.[83]

To these observations we answered elsewhere that the nature of Christ's victory over death was not established *a priori*, or even from the nature of His triumph over sin, but rather by taking into consideration the teaching of subsequent revelation, according to which Christ overcame death, not by not dying, but by not remaining dead, by rising again with a glorified body. Since Mary's victory is identically the same as Christ's, it follows that she, too, overcame death by rising again with a glorified body. As to the victory of all the just, we pointed out that it was not identically the same as Christ's, but rather an effect or result of it.[84]

The words of the Holy Father in his new Constitution would seem to confirm the views generally held by theologians before the definition. Thus, after stating that Our Blessed Lady shared

[83] J. F. Bonnefoy, "Définibilité de l'Assomption," *Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay* (Paris, 1950), pp. 236 f.

[84] J. B. Carol, O.F.M., "The Recent Marian Congress at Le Puy-en-Velay," *AER*, CXXIII, 3 (Sept. 1950), 280 f. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 276, our observations with regard to Fr. H. Rondet's article "Assomption et Corédemption," *Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay*, pp. 151-73.

most intimately the Redeemer's struggle against the infernal foe, he adds: "Consequently, just as the glorious Resurrection of Christ was an *essential* part and final sign of this victory, *so* that struggle which was *common* to the Blessed Virgin and her divine Son should be brought to a close by the glorification of her virginal body. . . ." The Holy Father's reasoning could not be more cogent: Christ and Mary shared the selfsame absolute struggle and complete victory over Satan; but Christ's Resurrection was an *essential* part of that struggle; therefore, so was Mary's. This is the same reasoning invoked by the Fathers of the Vatican Council,[85] by numerous Bishops in their petitions to the Holy See and, as we pointed out above, by the majority of Catholic theologians.[86]

(2) The *traditional* character of the doctrine is briefly but clearly expressed in the Apostolic Constitution in the following words: "We must remember especially that, *since the second century,* the Virgin Mary has been designated by the holy Fathers as the *New Eve,* who, although subject to the New Adam, is most intimately associated with Him in that struggle against the infernal foe. . . ." The Holy Father does not mention any specific witnesses from tradition, but it is obvious that he has in mind particularly the testimony of Saints Justin († c. 165) and Irenaeus († c. 202)[87] whose teaching was developed by numerous other Fathers and ecclesiastical writers of subsequent ages and has come down through the centuries as the expression of one of the fundamental principles in Mariology.[88] We need not insist on this point; it is abundantly attested to by history and, besides, accepted by all.

[85] Cf. *Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis,* VII (Friburg-im-Breisgau, 1882), 869 f.

[86] In his recent article in *Ephemerides Mariologicae,* I (1951), 107 f., Fr. Bonnefoy admits that Mary's victory was identical with Christ's and that she triumphed over death by her glorious resurrection. In that same article Bonnefoy seems to consider the Assumption as *virtually revealed* in Mary's Coredemption (pp. 129 f.), while before the definition the author thought that the Coredemption was only an *argumentum convenientiae.*

[87] Cf. Saint Justin, *Dial. cum Tryphone,* c. 100 (*MPG,* VI, 709 ff.). Saint Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses,* lib. 3, c. 22 (*MPG,* VII, 958 f.). Cf. J. M. Bover, S.J., "La mediación universal de la Segunda Eva en la tradición patrística," *Estudios eclesiásticos,* II (1923), 321-50.

[88] Cf. J. M. Bover, S.J., *Síntesis orgánica de la Mariología en función de la asociación de María a la obra redentora de Jesucristo* (Madrid, 1929).

(3) The question of the *biblical* argument in favor of the Assumption is more complex. In this connection we must distinguish between various texts which the Holy Father presents as used by some of the Scholastics in a more or less free and accommodated sense[89] and the Protoevangelium (*Gen.* 3:15), which he adduces as his own. The latter alone concerns us here.

The value of the Protoevangelium in favor of the Assumption was profusely discussed by theologians and exegetes prior to the solemn definition of November 1, and as we indicated above, there was no absolute agreement among scholars on this point. The new Constitution should have dispelled the last doubts and hesitations in this connection, but apparently it has not. No one questions, of course, that the document refers to the Protoevangelium as an argument in favor of Mary's Assumption. The Pope's words are clear and explicit. But the question is now being raised by some: does that mean that, according to the Constitution, Mary's prerogative is formally implicitly contained in Genesis 3:15? It would seem to us that anyone reading the document without professional prejudices would answer affirmatively. However, Fr. J. B. Bonnefoy, whose views on the matter are already known, has been quick to point out that the Bull not only does not justify such an interpretation, but rather confirms the opinion which he himself had advanced before November 1.

According to the learned author, the Constitution nowhere affirms that Mary's Assumption is signified (*signifiée*) in the Bible; the document merely states that the arguments of the Fathers and theologians are *based* on Sacred Scripture.[90] Besides, the Protoevangelium, adduced by the Holy Father in this connection, speaks formally of Christ's victory, *not* of Mary's. Hence, Bonnefoy argues, the Pope is using Genesis 3:15 not as a *biblical* argument, but rather as a basis for a conclusion which he reaches by means of a "true reasoning by resemblance or by analogy." In other words, we have here nothing more than an *argumentum ex ratione theologica* based on the Protoevangelium;[91] the Pope is giving us straight theology, not exegesis.[92] The author feels

[89] For example: *Ps.* 131:8; *Cant.* 8:3; *Ps.* 44. As to the use of *Apoc.* 12 in the Bull, cf. G. Bissonnette, *art. cit.* in *Marian Studies*, II (1951), 170-77.

[90] J. F. Bonnefoy, *art. cit.* in *Ephemerides Mariologicae*, p. 124.

[91] *Art. cit.*, p. 125.

[92] *Art. cit.*, p. 127.

that, even after the appearance of *Munificentissimus Deus,* he can still speak of "l'absence de *toute* donnée scripturaire relative à l'Assomption."[93]

We do not deny that Fr. Bonnefoy's interpretation is possible, but we doubt that it is probable. First of all, the argument from the Protoevangelium seems to stand out in the Pope's mind as the most important, solid and weighty of all the various biblical arguments brought forward by theologians in this connection. This we gather from the very first word of the paragraph under discussion: "*Maxime* autem illud memorandum est . . ." ("We must remember *especially* . . . etc."). On the other hand, the Pope is well aware of the fact that the majority of theologians require that a truth be at least formally implicitly revealed in order to proceed to a dogmatic definition.[94] Now we ask: is it likely that the Holy Father would select as his most important and significant argument one which does not exceed the limits of a theological conclusion? Are we to suppose that in such a grave matter as an *ex cathedra* definition he would ignore a teaching so generally received in theology and unexpectedly sanction the views of a minority? This unusual procedure on the part of the Holy See is quite possible, of course; but in the light of what we have seen, it seems to us highly improbable.

Again, it is not true, as Fr. Bonnefoy claims, that the document merely states that the arguments of the Fathers and theologians are *based* on Sacred Scripture. The Constitution immediately adds: "These [S. Scriptures] set the revered Mother of God as it were before our very eyes as most intimately joined to her divine Son and as always sharing His lot." To "set before our very eyes"

[93] *Art. cit.*, p. 122, n. 51.

[94] In his excellent article "L'Assomption de la T. S. Vierge est-elle définissable comme révélée 'formaliter implicite'?" in *Marianum*, XII (1950), 217, Fr. Bonnefoy claims that the terminology *formaliter implicite* was introduced by some in an effort to safeguard the definability of certain doctrines. Historically speaking, this seems to be correct. However, we hold that the Assumption is formally implicitly revealed, and at the same time we accept the view that theological conclusions (understood in Bonnefoy's sense) are definable. We see no incompatibility in that. For this reason, while the author's remarkable dissertation has convinced us of the definability of theological conclusions, it has not convinced us that the Assumption is not formally implicitly revealed.

("nobis veluti ante oculos *proponere*") is a little more than simply to insinuate or to furnish a background, in Bonnefoy's restricted sense. Besides—and note this well—in the paragraph specifically dealing with Genesis 3:15 the Holy Father clearly states that the struggle and victory which is common to the Redeemer and His associate is *foretold* (*praesignificatur*) in that biblical passage. Note the Latin verb used. To *signify* something beforehand, to *foretell,* to *announce* or *declare* something ahead of time (the official Italian translation has: *preannunziare*) seems to suggest considerably more than Fr. Bonnefoy is willing to admit. The expression, understood in its obvious sense, indicates that Mary's privilege was *contained* in the Protoevangelium, and not merely that the Protoevangelium gives us a basis for a theological conclusion *per modum analogiae.*

It is true that Mary's prerogative is contained in Genesis 3:15 only implicitly. It is true, furthermore, that if we were to consider the text and immediate context exclusively and abstracting from subsequent revelation and the teaching of the Magisterium, perhaps we never would have perceived its full meaning. But from this we may not argue that this meaning was not in the text itself from the very beginning; that it was not intended by the Holy Spirit; that it was "put into" the text by a subsequent interpretation of the Church.[95] According to the norms very insistently laid down by the Church, in order to discover the real sense intended by God in a given biblical passage the Catholic scholar must be guided not only by literary and circumstantial criteria, but by certain theological criteria as well. That is to say, he must diligently bear in mind the teaching of Catholic Tradition, the demands of the analogy of faith, and the interpretation indicated by the Magisterium.[96] Hence, if the Magisterium, represented

[95] Cf. the timely observations made by L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv., in his scholarly article "De Immaculatae Deiparae Assumptione post praecipua recentiora studia critica disquisitio," *Miscellanea Francescana,* XLVI (1946), 75. Incidentally, we believe this to be one of the very best dissertations on the complex problem of Mary's Assumption.

[96] Cf. *Acta apostolicae sedis,* XLII (1950), 501; A. Bea, *art. cit.,* pp. 556 f.; D. J. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., "The Use of Sacred Scripture in Mariology," *Marian Studies,* I (1950), 102-10, where the reader will find an excellent and very practical commentary on the mind of the Church in these matters.

here by Pius XII, assures us that Mary's complete triumph over Satan was foretold in Genesis 3:15, we must humbly accept this teaching and admit that such is the meaning of that passage *ex intentione Dei inspirantis.* We have, then, an *argumentum vere sed non mere scripturisticum,* as the exegetes would say. To contend, as some do, that an argument ceases to be biblical simply because subsequent revelation and the Magisterium have aided us in discovering the rich implications of a text, is incompatible with the principles of sound Catholic exegesis, as inculcated by recent papal documents.

From all that precedes we may safely conclude, *salvo meliori judicio,* that in the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* Pope Pius XII has authoritatively confirmed the opinion widely received among Catholic scholars that Our Lady's glorious resurrection and Assumption into heaven is formally implicitly revealed in the singular and total triumph of the Coredemptrix over the infernal foe, as foretold in Genesis 3:15. In so doing, the Holy Father seems to have had in mind particularly the numerous Bishops who, in their petitions to the Holy See, had argued from the fact that Mary's Assumption was "contained in the *revealed* doctrine of her Coredemption,"[97] and also the petitions of 311 Bishops (many of them at the time of the Vatican Council) who argued from the Protoevangelium in favor of the same prerogative.[98]

In this connection we are gratified to notice that our interpretation of the Papal Constitution is shared also by such competent scholars as Fr. A. Bea, S.J., the well-known exegete of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome,[99] and Fr. J. Filograssi, of the Gregorian University in Rome, who, incidentally, contributed considerably to hasten the day of the definition. In a recent commentary on the *Munificentissimus Deus,* Fr. Filograssi writes:

> Constitutio valide confirmat (licet non definiat) et Protoevangelium esse in sensum mariologicum interpretandum: et, pleniore sensu in-

[97] Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., "De Coredemptione B. V. Mariae in quibusdam postulatis ad Sanctam Sedem delatis," *Miscellanea Francescana,* XLVIII (1948), 85 ff. Cf. also Hentrich-De Moos, S.J., *Petitiones de Assumptione corporea B. V. Mariae in coelum definienda ad S. Sedem delatae,* II (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1942), 741.

[98] Cf. Hentrich-De Moos, *op. cit.,* II, 732 ff.

[99] A. Bea, *art. cit.,* pp. 557-61.

tellectum, revelationem implicitam continere tum Conceptionis Immaculatae tum Assumptionis. De duobus aliis Scripturae textibus—de salutatione angelica et de Apoc. 12—Constitutio mentionem facit (cf. p. 763); sed eis non attribuit valorem independentem, cum eos consideret uti testimonia traditionis SS. Patrum et theologorum. Aliter loquitur de Protoevangelio, cui *proprium* valorem attribuit, in quantum ejus sensus litteralis, prout ex exegesi Patrum elucet, respicit *plenam* Mariae victoriam, atque adeo Assumptionem corpoream ad gloriam caelestem.[100]

Substantially the same interpretation is proposed by the distinguished American prelate, the Most Rev. John J. Wright, Bishop of Worcester, Mass. Commenting on the passage which deals with Genesis 3:15, His Excellency writes:

Thus the Constitution brings that argument from Scripture, which had been acknowledged as the *strongest* [italics mine] before the definition, into close connection with the consideration of the harmony of this dogma with other revealed truths. Further, since these texts serve as a scriptural foundation for the defense of this truth . . . the definition of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God adds force to the proofs formerly used. . . . At the same time, the statements that some "have been rather free in their use of events and expressions taken from Sacred Scripture," and that they "employed statements and various images and analogies of Sacred Scripture to illustrate and to confirm the doctrine of the Assumption," sufficiently manifest that the *accommodated* sense of sacred texts has not the demonstrative value of the *typical sense* and much less of the *literal sense*. New value accrues to a text when the *magisterium* leads us to see more clearly how a truth is contained implicitly in Scripture and in tradition.[101]

Considering the tendencies now prevalent among scholars, it seems safe to predict that in the many analyses of the *Munificentissimus Deus* which will undoubtedly be written in the near future,

[100] J. Filograssi, "Constitutio Apostolica 'Munificentissimus Deus' (1 nov. 1950)," *Gregorianum*, XXXI (1950), 525. Cf. also pp. 511-14.

[101] Bishop John J. Wright, "The Dogma of the Assumption," *AER*, CXXIV, 2 (Feb. 1951), 89. Cf. also G. Bissonnette, "The Twelfth Chapter of the Apocalypse and Our Lady's Assumption," *Marian Studies*, II (1951), 172.

the interpretation we have suggested in this paper will be endorsed by the majority of commentators.[102]

J. B. Carol, O.F.M.

New York, N. Y.

[102] After finishing our paper, two other commentaries on the recent Bull have come to our notice: B. García Rodríguez, C.M.F., "La razón teológica en la Constitución 'Munificentissimus Deus'," *Ephemerides Mariologicae,* I (1951), 45-88; and Ovidio Casado, C.M.F., "Boletín Asuncionista," *ibid.,* pp. 131-71. The former favors the view that the Assumption is virtually revealed in the Protoevangelium (pp. 50 f.) and also in Our Lady's Coredemption (pp. 84 f.). The latter seems to favor a formally implicit revelation in the Protoevangelium, which he calls the view generally received among theologians (p. 166), and also in Mary's Coredemption (p. 168). Fr. Bonnefoy's commentary, which appeared in this same issue of *Ephem. Mariol.,* was known to us only in reprint form. This explains why in our article we referred to him and not to the others.

The Greatness of Columbus

We have the record of not a few brave and experienced men, both before and after Christopher Columbus, who with stubbornness and zeal explored unknown lands and seas yet more unknown. . . . He was distinguished by this unique note, that in his work of traversing and retraversing immense tracts of ocean, he looked for something greater and higher than did these others. We say not that he was unmoved by perfectly honorable aspirations after knowledge, and deserving well of human society; nor did he despise glory, which is a most engrossing ideal to great souls; nor did he altogether scorn a hope of advantage to himself; but to him far before all these human considerations was the consideration of his ancient faith, which unquestionably endowed him with strength of mind and will, and often strengthened and consoled him in the midst of the greatest difficulties. This view and aim is known to have possessed his mind above all; namely, to open a way for the Gospel over new lands and seas.

—Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Quarto abrupto saeculo,* July 16, 1902.

BISHOP SHEEN'S THRESHOLD APOLOGETICS

"Theological students sometimes think that one brings souls to Our Lord by a simple program: master the arguments for the existence of God: memorize the proofs for the Divinity of Christ from prophecy, miracles, and consonance of Christ's doctrine with the aspirations of the human heart; and then shoot them all like bullets at the opposition. The expectation is that souls will fall before the machine guns of our syllogisms. . . . Many manuals are written from the point of view of one who has always had the Faith; they outline the logical steps by which one might approach it. But those who come to the Faith do not always begin with the logical steps; these proofs are necessary, later, for instructions and full understanding, but they do not mark the beginning of a conversion."

This quotation is taken from Bishop Sheen's latest book, *Lift Up Your Heart*, (pp. 271, 272). It expresses a train of thought that he has treated at length in his three most recent books. It is the fact that although the *philosophia perennis* and classical apologetics are still supremely valid, they are "necessary, later, for instructions and full understanding, but do not mark the beginning of a conversion." For the modern non-Catholic the spirit of the age demands a preliminary approach, a propaedeutic, threshold apologetics.

The term "threshold apologetics" might be not ineptly applied to Bishop Sheen's present appeal to non-Catholics. The phrase "threshold apologetics" was used by Auguste Valensin, S.J., in an article in the *Dictionnaire apologétique* about the Method of Immanence. Here he undertook a defense of Maurice Blondel's early writings, especially *L'Action* of 1893; he applied the phrase to Blondel's endeavor to elaborate a system of thought which would, by its autonomous movement, lead the thinker to Christianity, to the realization that "action" brings man to the unavoidable option of the rejection or acceptance of a transcendent God.

Bishop Sheen, like Blondel, is convinced that unless a man sees in Catholicism something which answers the questions in his own heart, a solution for his own needs and anxieties, that man is as yet not ripe for conversion. In other words, both Blondel and

Bishop Sheen have followed the method of immanence. But there is this essential difference between their methods: Blondel attempted to construct a *philosophy,* which, by the logic of its own movement, would bring one face to face with the Christian problem. But Bishop Sheen pleads for a psychological approach to the *philosophia perennis,* an integration of popular problems with the classical philosophy of the Schools. This means that the classical philosopher must speak a language that is intelligible to the modern man, "must dig out of his treasures new things and old."

This method of apologetic is apparent in Bishop Sheen's last three books: *Philosophy of Religion* (1948), *Peace of Soul* (1949), and *Lift Up Your Heart* (1950). The first work gives the theory directing the writing of the other two books. The last two are popular expressions of his threshold apologetics and are rewrites of recent Lenten radio series on "The Catholic Hour." The content of *Peace of Soul* Bishop Sheen delivered for the most part in the Lenten series of 1948 under the title "The Modern Soul in Search of God." *Lift Up Your Heart* he presented substantially in 1949 in the group of talks entitled "The Love That Waits for You."

It would, then, be an unfair and short-sighted judgment of their value to consider *Peace of Soul* and *Lift Up Your Heart* as just two more guides to confident living or directives toward a mature mind. They are vital presentations of an apologetic keyed for moderns by an apostolic writer keenly aware of the mentality of his non-Catholic and non-Christian audience.

Though he suggests in *Peace of Soul* and *Lift Up Your Heart* why he speaks thus, it is in his *Philosophy of Religion* that one can grasp a better explanation of his method. Here he gives the principles which he applies in the other two more popular books. The *Philosophy of Religion* is not solely or primarily an exposition of his reasons for the use of threshold apologetics, but in different sections and especially the Fourth Part, one can find his tenets and realize that they have guided him in his writing of the other two books.

In Part One Bishop Sheen treats "the history of the abandonment of reason and the final descent to irrationalism." In telling strokes he paints the picture of Rationalism's counter-reaction in Romanticism; the latter in turn yielded to an age of Mechanism and

Mechanism devolved into Irrationalism. Metaphysics had finally been completely dethroned and today unreason rules.

So Part Four "takes cognizance of the contemporary indifference to metaphysics. . . . There is a suggestion . . . that religion can be approached from the starting point of frustrated man as well as from the view of nature and the cosmos."

Bishop Sheen tells us (p. 348) that the "Frustrated Man is one who has within himself some radical tension—who is groaning for some kind of sublimation or deliverance." The reality of Frustrated Man is undeniable. Recourse is made to the awareness of present day writers, theologians, and philosophers to confirm the fact.

Literary men were conscious of Frustrated Man. Dostoevski was their prophet when he foresaw a disillusioned Liberal Man who opposed God and found himself subject to dark forces which destroyed his personality. Further evidence might be found in the writings of D. H. Lawrence, James Joyce, T. F. Powys, and others who sensed man's frustration and offered their own inadequate and generally false solutions.

Among the modern theologians Kierkegaard proclaimed that the naturally good man does not exist: that man was obsessed with conflict and tension. He found an answer in the "existential relation between the soul and God." Kierkegaard told his stirring conviction of despair, but his answers to it were not sufficient because of their subjectivity, anti-intellectualism, contempt of the historical, and denial of corporate religion. Karl Barth clings to the Lutheran doctrine of man's essential corruption in his "theology of crisis." Reinhold Niebuhr rejected liberal Protestantism and "discovered" original sin.

From the philosophers, eloquent testimony is read in the pages of Friedrich Nietzsche, Nicolas Berdyaev, and C. E. M. Joad that modern man is frustrated. Especially Marxism and Freudianism—Bishop Sheen's arch-enemies—have contributed to this realization. Throughout the *Philosophy of Religion* he restates Marx's message; Freud's views are criticized in *Peace of Soul.* The theories of both Marx and Freud are integral to the thought of the twentieth century. Both are deterministic: Marx preached economic determinism and Freud biological determinism. Both are anti-rational since they dismiss the significance of man's higher

faculties. Both are revolutionary and adhere tenaciously to the idea of conflict. With Marx it was capital *versus* labor; with Freud it was the "id" against society. Both, therefore, are reductively philosophers of despair.

But their most certain contribution was to remove from men's mind the romantic illusion of optimism and to emphasize the presence of conflict. In their non-rational solutions Marx and Freud proved by their reaction to the previous rationalism that "reason" is no answer to man's despair; hence they unwittingly proclaim that man's salvation must come from a force outside reason, faith.

The essential and all-important conclusion, then, that Bishop Sheen draws from all these writers, theologians, and philosophers is that man has become conscious of evil, of conflict within, of discord in his own house.

Armed with the witness of these modern minds, Bishop Sheen writes in *Peace of Soul,* "The complexities, anxieties, and fears of the modern soul . . . are so much a part of modern man that one would think they were tattooed on him. Whatever his condition, the modern man must be brought back to God and happiness. But how?" (p. 6). "If the modern soul wants to begin its quest for peace with its psychology instead of our own metaphysics, we will begin with psychology" (p. 7). Again he says, "It may very well be that the new apologetic to the modern soul will start with the contributions of modern psychiatry on the subject of conflict, that it will be a kind of preface to the tract *De peccato originali,* which is relatively the most important treatise for the modern mind" (p. 36).

In the *Philosophy of Religion* (pp. 362-69) Bishop Sheen offers a succinct outline of the sources for the modern apologetic. He holds that there must be a return to St. Thomas and a rereading in modern terms of the *Prima Secundae* of the *Summa theologica.* "It is this section that the Thomists must make their point of departure for contact with the modern mind, for here is the Thomistic treatise on Frustrated Man."

Translating the classical questions of St. Thomas into present-day terms, Bishop Sheen points out that "This section opens with a description of the tensions within man, each one of which is occasioned by the attempt to satisfy the infinite urges with the limitations of the finite. Man becomes frustrated by having no

over-all purpose in life but only multiple desires (Q. 1, aa. 3, 5); by the pursuit of popularity as the essence of happiness (Q. 2, a. 3, ad 3); by making the end of life the acquisition of power, either economic or political (Q. 2, a. 4) . . ." In Questions 22 to 48 of the same section, *Prima Secundae,* St. Thomas discusses the passions. This section Bishop Sheen claims is one of the "most profound treatments of the subject of passion in philosophical and psychological literature." Later in the same part, St. Thomas points out that "the principal causes of frustration are threefold: internal, external and historical (Q. 75, a. 1). The internal causes of frustration are an excessive concentration on a passion or appetite to the exclusion of . . . the will . . . (Q. 76). The external cause of frustration is the demonic element in history and nature . . . (Q. 80). The historical cause is an abuse of freedom in the historical beginnings of the human family (Q. 81)."

Bishop Sheen concludes his summary outline by quoting St. Thomas (*Contra Gentiles,* III, 71) to the effect that the existence of evil is not a denial of God but an affirmation of Divinity, for ". . . there would be no evil if the order of good were removed, the privation of which is evil: and there would be no such order, if there were no God." If modern man is tortured with the problem of evil, it is on this ground that the Catholic apologist must meet him. Previously Bishop Sheen had established the fact that "The problems which modern philosophy present do suggest some neglected aspects of truth." Man as a problem is one of these. Further, "Irrationalism is stalking the earth; why not recognize it, diagnose it, heal it, then rationalize it, and bring it, in all of its forms, back to that *Ipsum Esse,* . . . Who . . . inspired St. John to define Him for theologians as Love . . ." Evil, frustration, and irrationalism, therefore, are the problems to be faced. These Bishop Sheen confronts in his threshold apologetics.

We will not attempt to show in detail how Bishop Sheen applies his own apologetic in *Peace of Soul* and *Lift Up Your Heart.* But he does not set himself to present in practice what he has in theory advocated in the *Philosophy of Religion.* A reading of *Peace of Soul* and *Lift Up Your Heart* in the light of the *Prima Secundae* of the *Summa theologica* shows a brilliant adaptation of the same truths of St. Thomas recast in terms with meaning for modern

minds. Hardly a chapter of these two books can be scanned without hearing an echo of the ancient questions of St. Thomas.

By a clever imitation of the Freudian topography of the person, Bishop Sheen in both books teaches about the level of the "ego" which is the subhuman or the animal man, about the "I" which is the rational man, and about man on the third level which is the supernatural or divine level. In both books he scrutinizes and explains the inner sense of loneliness, frustration, and fear which modern man has (and which in *Lift Up Your Heart* he calls "Black Grace") that he might lure men into the acceptation of sanctifying or "White Grace." In both books he dwells on the thirst of modern man for the Water of Life; he implicitly and explicitly directs ego-centric man to the path that leads to the "Living Spirit of Christ, Who prolongs Himself in His Mystical Body and diffuses His life through its seven life-giving channels."

DANIEL J. SHINE, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

THE VIRTUE OF SIMPLICITY

The virtue of simplicity excludes all useless turning back upon oneself, which would in fact be duality; but that is only the negative aspect. More positively, simplicity consists in a certain transparency of soul; perfect naturalness in all circumstances and before everyone; a gift of freshness, detached and entirely open; of frankness which is not merely artlessness, but trust in God and our neighbors; a faculty of wonder and an innate tendency toward admiration, because everything appears great to the great, pure to the pure.

—Fr. Raoul Plus, S.J., in *Simplicity* (Westminster, Maryland, The Newman Press, 1951), p. 32.

OUR ROSARY BEADS

God forbid that we mar these few thoughts on the Rosary with jest at the outset. It's to good purpose, however, believe us. Merciless fun has been poked at the absent-minded old pastor describing the Annunciation in a Sunday sermon. "And what was she doing when the angel Gabriel came into her house? Why she was busily telling her beads of course." If someone deigns to explain the joke, he will tell you that "everyone knows that St. Dominic introduced the beads a good dozen centuries after the Annunciation."

Or did he? (We have no dispute with the learned sons of St. Dominic, as you'll presently see.) Nine centuries *before* the Annunciation, and twenty before St. Dominic, a sculptor in Nineveh carved two women in an attitude of prayer before a tree. Their right hands are uplifted, and their left hands are holding a string of beads. Thus Layard describes the carving in his *Monuments of Nineveh.* And if we can believe Marco Polo in his thirteenth-century best seller *Delle meraviglie del mondo,* the king of Malabar wore "hanging from his neck a silken cord studded with one hundred and fifty emeralds and sapphires, on which he said his morning and evening orisons before the idol." At any rate the use of beads for prayer is not of Christian origin. They were known to the pagan world. The Hebrews may have used them for counting off prayers too. And if so, Mary could well have been "counting her beads" when Gabriel brought her the good tidings of universal Grace.

All of which is just a way of beginning. The beads preceded the Rosary. In fact the original meaning of Rosary or "rosarium" was a book: an anthology of beautiful passages culled from many authors on some chosen topic: love, parting, mother, life, death. The Middle Ages with their love for Our Lady set to fashioning Rosaries in honor of Mary, composing psalms in praise of her to match the 150 Psalms of David. St. Anselm of Canterbury (1109) made such a Rosary. St. Bonaventure (1274) divided his psalms into three groups, the first group of fifty commenced with the word *Ave,* the next with *Salve,* and the final fifty psalms, each commenced with the word *Gaude.* Such Rosaries of Marian praise took the name of "Our Lady's Psalter."

But there was a difficulty, especially for the poor and uneducated. They could not read the beautiful psalters of Our Lady. They were too poor to own one in the first place! So gradually the custom of reciting a certain number of *Aves* on a string of beads became the substitute for the Lady Psalter. By the thirteenth century the number of *Aves* was set at one hundred and fifty to equal the number of the Psalms of David.

Before the advent of St. Dominic two elements of the present-day Rosary were already extant: the use of a string of beads for prayer, and the practice of reciting one hundred and fifty *Aves* (up to the words "ventris tui"). It was after St. Dominic that the Carthusian, Henry Egher (1328-1408) was told by Our Lady in a vision to recite the Paternoster after each ten *Aves.* And shortly after that, the idea of meditating on the mysteries was introduced, by another Carthusian, Dominic of Treves (1461). However, the fifteen mysteries as we have them today were determined only in the eighteenth century, by the Constitution *Pretiosus* of Benedict XIII, which prescribed meditation on the mysteries in order to gain the indulgences.

But all this in no way detracts from the stature of St. Dominic. It was he who popularized the use of the beads as a weapon stronger than voice or sword to do battle with the heretics in the South of France. His many sons continued the battle cry of Dominic. They made the Rosary a weapon against the Powers of Darkness. In 1474 when Cologne was beseiged by Karl the Bold of Burgundy, the Dominican Jakob Sprenger persuaded the citizens to establish a Confraternity of the Rosary at Cologne. The danger passed.

Another Dominican in the person of Pius V (1572) used the weapon of the Rosary likewise against the Darkness that threatened his pontificate. In the north whole countries were breaking away from the Faith in the upheaval of the Protestant revolt. To the south the blood-thirsty Turk threatened the lands of Christendom. From the outset of his pontificate he had enriched the recital of the Rosary with many new indulgences, he had prescribed processions for the members of the Rosary Confraternities. When a council of war was held at Messina where the Christian fleet had gathered, against the judgment of the old warrior Louis Requesenz, Pius argued that the Christian fleet should attack the Turks. He

had certain intimations of victory from above. Next he ordered that the entire fleet should fast for three days, and march in a Rogation Procession on the Feast of the Name of Mary. Only then did they weigh anchor and set sail. One thing more, the "Pope of the Rosary" ordered that before battle the army must call on God and the Blessed Virgin, Mother of Christ. And so it was done.

At the same hour in the papal apartments, Pius was dealing with Bartolo Bussotto, his treasurer, when suddenly he broke off and turned towards the window looking up into the sky. He remained thus a long while. Then turning back to Bussotto he said: "This is no time for business. Go and thank God for at this moment our fleet has won the day." It was some days before the news reached Rome of the destruction of the Turkish fleet off Lepanto. And Pius, who had so frequently besought the faithful to beg Mary's help in the Rosary, ascribed the great Christian victory of Oct. 7, 1571, to Our Blessed Lady.

When Venice declared the day a national holiday, Pope Gregory XIII in 1573 ordained that the Rosary Confraternity should thenceforth keep the first Sunday of October as the Feast of Our Lady of the Rosary.

The threat of the Turk continued to hang over Christendom, but the Holy Father and the faithful held to the Rosary. When the siege of Vienna was lifted, on Sept. 12, 1683, that day became the Feast of the Name of Mary. Again, after the victory of Prince Eugene at Temescar, on the Feast of Our Lady of the Snows in 1716, the Feast of the Most Holy Rosary was extended to the Universal Church.

There is a point in all this to remember. History has a habit of repeating itself. It is no longer the sickle moon on the green flag of the prophet, but the sickle and hammer on the red flag of Atheistic Communism, that threatens Christendom. And once more it is the Rosary that is the weapon against the Powers of Darkness. Only this time it is different.

Now it is no longer a pope who exhorts us to recite the Rosary, but Our Lady herself. At Lourdes she deigned to show herself reciting the Rosary with little St. Bernadette. At Fatima she pleaded for more and more prayer, especially for the Rosary. And

she pledged her word as Mother of God that "if men pray . . . there will be peace."

While countries are amassing a stockpile of atomic weapons, Catholics are beginning to amass a stockpile of prayer. Wherever the Pilgrim Virgin of Fatima goes on its perpetual world tour it reminds the thousands who welcome it of the Rosary. Along with reparation and consecration to the Immaculate Heart, those who escort the white statue preach prayer, particularly the Rosary.

In more than five thousand cities and communities the radio reminds people to say the Rosary. Dozens of stations carry a fifteen-minute radio Rosary daily. In the Boston area Archbishop Cushing personally broadcasts the Rosary from his residence. Fr. Patrick Peyton has launched his Family Rosary Crusade in over sixty dioceses of North America in the past three years. His goal is to get ten million families praying the Rosary every night together. "The Family that prays together, stays together."

Then there is "Operation Fatima," another ingenious reminder to say the Rosary. It commenced in Cleveland, I believe. A pastor made the suggestion to a group of housewives that they might enlist others to join them in the Rosary simply by phoning them. So Cleveland's telephones began to tinkle, and soon the phones of other cities as "Operation Fatima" got under way.

"Block Rosaries" are another means to the common recitation of the beads. The people living on one city block, or in the same neighborhood, gather each night for ten brief minutes in a different house for the Rosary. There is no Coke and cake, no impositions on hospitality. Ten minutes of prayer and then off about their business. The Block Rosary idea is still new and not known to all, if we can judge by the sweet young thing who dropped into Barclay Street recently. She asked if they had any of those "Block Rosaries" everyone's talking about!

Some time in the next hundred years, we hope, the Holy Father will establish a new feast for the Universal Catholic Church. It will be a new feast of Our Lady, commemorating her stunning victory over the forces of Atheistic Communism. The stockpile is a-building now. Rosaries are multiplied over and over, by more and more Catholics. Our Lady has made the promise, and the Mother of God is as good as her word.

JAMES J. GALVIN, C.SS.R.

Esopus, N. Y.

THE LAYMAN'S OBLIGATION TO PERFECTION

Catholic thought of today shows increased interests in the precise nature of the layman's obligation to perfection,[1] and speculation on this subject has not been without divergent tendencies. On the one hand, moral theologians, legitimately concerned to preserve liberty where liberty exists, have reiterated the truth that substantial growth in holiness is continuous, if only the soul preserves the state of grace. On the other hand, certain publications have so insisted on the Divine invitation to sanctity, upon functional holiness, upon a zealous opposition to secularism and naturalism, that an incautious reader of these publications might conclude that the counsels are of obligation for all.

Pope Pius XI gave impetus to this increased interest by his encyclical on St. Francis de Sales, in which he declared his conviction that the holy Bishop seemed to have been raised up by God to bear witness to the truth that holiness is for all Christians. He further stated that it was among his dearest wishes that the faithful should have recalled to them "the duty of each one to cultivate his own holiness."[2] Pope Pius XI again expressed the truth that holiness of life is not a singular gift conceded to only a few but rather the "common destiny and common duty" of all.[3] In praising the life and writings of the Bishop of Geneva, he warns against "that opinion already old in his time, and still alive, that holiness worthy of the name, such as the Catholic Church proposes, either cannot be achieved by most of the faithful or demands such arduous efforts that it is to be left to the few whom God has gifted with high and lofty souls."[4] The Holy Father further condemns the opinion that such holiness implies so wearying a labor that it is simply not suitable for those outside the cloister. St. Francis de Sales has himself shown to all the same way of Christian perfection and holiness that he personally travelled.

These lines of Pius XI in *Rerum omnium* proposed nothing that

[1] "The essence of perfection consists in love of God." A. Tanquerey, S.S., *The Spiritual Life*, n. 320.
[2] *AAS*, XV (1923), 59.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

was entirely new in the Church's teaching on the subject, but merely emphasized more clearly what it had been her teaching for centuries. In 816 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle had rebuked those who felt that the narrow path of holiness was suited only to the quiet tread of monks and obligatory on them alone.[5] Catholic theologians, leaning upon the unvarying exhortations of Scripture and the traditional interpretations of the Fathers, had always taught some obligation on the part of the ordinary Christian to seek perfection. Only by stubbornly resisting the evidence of clear and open Scripture could they have failed to do so.

Our Lord Himself had invited His followers to "be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (*Matt.* 5:48). St. Paul is unremitting in urging his followers to be "perfect." The conclusion of his Second Letter to the Corinthians encourages the Corinthians to be perfected, to be comforted and to be of the same mind, at peace, that the God of peace and love may dwell with them (*II Cor.* 13:11). Paul presses upon the Christian a preoccupation with every virtue, that he may grow in holiness by consideration of these things. "Whatever things are true, whatever humble, whatever lovable, whatever of good repute, if there be any virtue, if anything worthy of praise, think on these things" (*Phil.* 4:8). For the body of Christians is the body of Christ and must be kept pure and undefiled in God's sight. "Now He has reconciled you in His body of flesh through His death to present you holy and undefiled and irreproachable before Him" (*Col.* 1:22-24). Paul's constant prayer is that the faithful may know more fully God's will and live that will more completely. "This is why we have been praying for you unceasingly and asking that you may be filled with knowledge of His will in all spiritual vision and understanding" (*Col.* 1:9). The writings of St. Paul repeatedly refer to the early Christians as "saints," as those called to be saints, and St. Paul's exhortations evidence a longing that this sanctity be whole, complete, involving a dedication to perfection.[6]

[5] ". . . non solum monachis et clericis, verum etiam omnibus qui christiano modo censentur vocabulo, per hanc arctam et angustam intrandum esse viam." Cited in J. De Guibert, S.J. (ed.), *Documenta ecclesiastica christianae perfectionis studium spectantia* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1931), n. 117.

[6] *Rom.* 1:7; *I Cor.* 1:2; *II Cor.* 1:1; *Eph.* 1:1.

That the frequent exhortations to holiness in the Scriptures imply more than a mere *invitation* is clear from Revelation itself. We are commanded to love God with all our heart, all our soul and all our mind (*Deut.* 6:5; *Matt.* 23:27). That charity, in which perfection consists, is therefore urged upon us without restriction or limit, as an ideal towards which we must constantly strive.[7] The very frequency and insistence of Scriptural admonitions to seek perfection forbid us to interpret them as mere counsels. Thus St. Paul categorically states: "This is the will of God, your sanctification."[8] God's will imposes upon us the obligation of a genuine effort to fulfill it. St. Peter, in his exhortations, speaks in the same terms as the Apostle of the Gentiles. "But as the one who has called you is Holy, be ye also holy in all your behavior; for it is written, 'Ye shall be holy because I am Holy'" (*I Pet.* 1:15-16). St. Peter stresses increasing growth for the Christian, ever-increasing knowledge and love of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The Christians should crave, as new-born babies, pure spiritual milk, that they may grow to perfection (*I Pet.* 2:2; *II Pet.* 3:18).

St. Thomas Aquinas, interpreting the data of Scripture, and taking into account the constant teaching of the Fathers, exposed in clear-cut Scholastic terminology the truth which these sources embodied. St. Thomas begins with the truth that the end of every commandment is charity (*I Tim.* 1:5). But when there is question of an end, we do not seek for a measure to decide how much of the end we will have. It is true that we measure the *means* to the end, but this is merely to insure that they will be adapted to, proportionate to the end so that we may attain the end in its fulness. We cannot have too much of an end like health; therefore we do not measure health, but rather the means to it: the medicine, the exercise, the food. Nor should we ever say: "So much charity is enough; the rest is merely a matter of counsel"; for charity, in which perfection consists, is an end in itself. It is in fact the end

[7] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 184, a. 3.

[8] *I Thess.* 4:3; cf. *I Thess.* 3:13. Cf. J. M. Vosté, O.P., *Commentarius in epistulas ad Thessalonicenses* (Rome and Paris, 1917), p. 117: "Sanctificatio vestra: ἁγιασμός . . . distinguitur ab ἁγιότης, quae est abstracta qualitas sanctitatis, ab ἁγιωσύνη, quae est sanctimonia seu sanctitatis status; ἁγιασμός est inter utrumque, ut via ad statum; est scil., prout in Vg. optime vertitur, sanctificatio activa, quam, volente et adjuvante Deo, semper prosequi debemus."

of all precepts and counsels. The love of God is not a thing to be measured out, in terms of greater and less; it is rather an ideal, which does not admit of excess, but which is to be approached more and more closely.[9]

The obligation to perfect charity may seem an almost impossible burden at first glance, but as St. Thomas explains it, this is not true. The perfection of charity falls under the precept to love God not as the *matter* of the precept, but as the *end*.[10] In other words we must always strive towards perfect charity as towards our end, but we have not failed to obey the precept if our charity is not perfect. In discussing this question of the matter of the precept St. Thomas points out that the substance of the commandment is observed if nothing is loved more than God, if the lowest necessary degree of charity is kept, if charity itself is kept through the avoidance of mortal sin. He who avoids mortal sin has kept the essence of the precept of charity and possesses essential perfection. His charity will gain him an eternal reward if he perseveres in that state, for his charity has fulfilled the lowest demands necessary to attain beatitude. His perfection is essential, incipient perfection. Only secondarily does Christian perfection consist in observing the counsels which are most apt means to perfection. But at this point we must distinguish between the spirit of the counsels and the exterior acts which are at once a means of cultivating this spirit and a manifestation of it. The Beatitude represents the high peak of the spirit of the counsels; and the Christian is obliged to cultivate poverty of spirit, meekness, hunger and thirst after justice, and all the other interior attitudes described by the Beatitudes. He is not however obliged to externalize these attitudes in the corresponding outward acts, which are effective means of obtaining perfection. That is, he is not obliged to actual observance of perpetual evangelical poverty, chastity, and obedience. But he must strive to maintain that spirit of detachment from the world which such observance is intended to foster. And he must, furthermore,

[9] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 27, a. 6: "In dilectione Dei non potest accipi modus sicut in re mensurata, ut sit in ea accipere plus et minus; sed sicut invenitur modus in mensura, in quo non potest esse excessus, sed quanto plus attingitur regula, tanto melius est."

[10] On this and the following paragraph, see the whole of *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 27, a. 6.

be ready for such observance as may, here and now, be necessary that he may avoid serious sin.[11]

St. Thomas' explanation of the obligation to perfection is a lucid exposition of what the ordinary Christian's obligations are in this matter; but furthermore he insists on man's needs to grow in charity, to cultivate his holiness.[12] It is the very nature of an end that has not been perfectly attained that it should draw the person on to that perfect possession: by an inherent drive in the case of happiness in general, by a divine call to free will in the case of charity. If then the Angelic Doctor's position on the obligation to perfect charity has at times been given a minimizing interpretation (which would staticize charity and give it the nature of a means instead of an end), such an interpretation does not do justice to his conception of charity or to his metaphysics of finality. Furthermore, the burden of fallen human nature is such that unless man makes an effort to progress he will not long remain in the state of grace. There are grave precepts whose fulfillment by the ordinary Christian may at times demand lofty self-abnegation; unless the Christian is schooled in generosity, it is difficult to see how he can then avoid serious sin. Unless he has accustomed himself to do more than avoid serious sin, unless he has aimed at some measure of perfection beyond avoiding grave sin, he will not long preserve essential perfection.[13]

The life of grace and charity is a true life and implies the movement, action, growth which accompany life. The ascetical theologians and, in fact, Holy Scripture itself describe the spiritual life as a journeying to God. Men are *viatores*, travelers on the way, men who have not here a lasting city; and it is expected of them that they will move towards the goal of union with God. We are "pilgrims and strangers on earth" (*Heb.* 11:13). It is in this sense that St. Peter urges Christians "as pilgrims and strang-

[11] Cf. Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentary on Matthew*, V, 48.

[12] The Church's approval of this position of St. Thomas is reflected in the encyclical *Studiorum Ducem*, *AAS*, XV (1923), 312.

[13] A detailed discussion of the theology of the layman's *vocation* to sanctity may be found in Rev. William R. O'Connor, *The Layman's Call* (New York: Kenedy, 1942). The renowned Catholic philosopher, Dietrich von Hildebrand offered a penetrating study of a similar theme in *Katholisches Berufsethos* (1931).

ers to abstain from carnal desires which war against the soul" (*I Pet.* 2:11). This same theme—the necessity of progress—is found in many of the doctors and fathers of the spiritual life.

St. Augustine is very forceful in addressing the faithful on the subject of continual progress to perfection. Stressing the operative character of charity, he asserts the impossibility of remaining stationary upon the road to perfection. Either we advance or we retreat. He who has once said "enough" has already perished! He who would return to a point of perfection already passed regresses in the spiritual life.

> You acknowledge that we are travelers, yet you would like to know in what this traveling consists: I'll answer briefly: "Get on the march" —for fear that you would drift lazily along, not understanding how necessary it is to move onward. You must always be dissatisfied with your present achievement if you want to arrive at a further goal. For where you are content with your progress, there you will halt. But if you once say: It is enough at that point you have already failed. Always give more, always keep advancing, always on the march; don't dally on the way, don't turn back, don't turn from the path. He who doesn't advance, stands still; he who returns to a point of perfection already passed, is on the road back.[14]

St. John Chrysostom corrects those who would say that only monks need strive for perfection, and he points out to his listener that the Sermon on the Mount was addressed not only to monks but to all who would follow Jesus. The whole human race and not only monks are ordered to enter in by the narrow gate, to hold their life in hatred in this world; and all Christ's great and wonderful commandments were addressed to a universal audience.[15]

St. Bernard, in an engaging dialogue, exhorts his disciples to continual progress in terms that would not have won him the title of the Mellifluous Doctor:

> Where are those who are saying: we've come far enough, we don't want to be better than our fathers? My good monk, you don't want to make further progress? No. You want to be a failure then? Not at all. Well, what then? I want to stay just as I am, I'm content with the progress I've made. I won't permit myself to slip back, but I've no great anxiety to go ahead either. In that case you are simply asking

---

[14] St. Augustine, *Sermo 169*, c. 15, n. 18; cf. *Sermo 96*, c. 7, n. 9.

[15] St. John Chrysostom, *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*, I, 3, n. 14.

for what is impossible. For what is there on this earth that stands still? At the point that I cease to press forward, at that point I've begun to fall back. It's perfectly clear that I've failed already, the moment I stop looking for progress.[16]

Bernard urges the same truth in another letter even more pointedly: in the spiritual life one either moves forward or backward. Progress is absolutely necessary.

We have not here a lasting city. Nor have we yet arrived at the goal; we are still in search of it. You must go up, then, or down; try to stand still, and you will certainly come to ruin. It is by no means certain that that man is a good man who doesn't want to be better; and the moment you are unwilling to better your state, at that moment you already cease to be good.[17]

This dynamic notion of the spiritual life of the Christian is present in all the great ascetical teachers; it sounds through the Gospels, the Fathers, the documents of the Church. The Christian is always obliged to keep moving towards perfect charity. He must always keep perfect charity in view as an ideal, and develop beyond the degree of charity he already possesses. The great precept of charity stands, as it were, at the summit of perfection and below it stand its explicit determinations, the commandments. These commandments form, on the negative side, a definite list of "don'ts" whose complete neglect will destroy the domination of the great precept over the soul. On the positive side, the commandments point out the indispensable means of preserving the great precept. The lower limits are fixed by what we call mortal sin. To have escaped those lower limits and gained safety gives no one the right to cease from effort. If one stops here and declares himself satisfied, he will not long preserve charity in his soul. The Christian must always strive to press beyond the point of perfection reached; in fact, to call a halt is already a regression. In this sense it can be said that the will to make no further progress is already a sin, for the Christian has failed in his duty to tend to perfection.

There is a sense in which this obligation to progress is central to Christianity, for it marks a radical departure from other religions, placing Christianity on a level all its own, giving to Chris-

[16] St. Bernard, *Ep.* 254.
[17] St. Bernard, *Ep.* 91.

tianity an orientation and a dynamism that set it apart. The ideal of perfection set for the Christian assures him of an ever-present stimulus to foster within himself the indefinite development of the new life planted in him at Baptism. This may explain the solicitude of the saints before slight imperfections, a solicitude marvelously combined with the liberty of the children of God. In the light of Him who dwells in inaccessible light, darkness may seem more dark. And the closer the Christian soul approaches to Infinite Charity, the more imperious are the demands of its own love.

What has been said above represents the usual way of posing the problem of the Christian's obligation to perfection. But there is another way of posing the problem that has recently received considerable attention. It is skillfully presented in the writings of the French theologian, Yves de Montcheuil, whose death in the last war cut short a career of great distinction. Fr. Montcheuil distinguishes two classes of Christians, as did Augustine.[18] The first class comprises those to whom Christianity appears primarily, though not exclusively, as a law, as a "contract" with God promising a reward for faithful obedience and a great reward for ardent obedience. For this class, the description of the obligation to perfection set forth above will be of great help. But there is a second class of Christians also, and it is in treating of them that Fr. Montcheuil complements the classical approach with valuable insights.

The second class visualizes its relations to God more exclusively in personal terms, more in terms of their personal love of God. On this plane the notion of "obligation" is enveloped in the notion of striving for a complete self-donation. Obligation does not have the same force between two persons whose love is mutual; neither considers the other precisely under the aspect of obligation.[19] One is indeed ontologically still "obliged" to obey, but for the lover there is no strict obligation to love; his love wishes to realize itself totally, grieves that it is still imperfect, and tends to perfection from its own weight. He sees that there are faults gravely and less gravely opposed to that love, but the perspective has changed, for the lover no longer compares the faults to the recompense of

[18] Yves de Montcheuil, *Mélanges théologiques* (Paris: Aubier, 1944), p. 358; *Problèmes de vie spirituelle* (Paris: Editions de l'Epé, 1948), pp. 74 ff.

[19] *Problèmes de vie spirituelle*, p. 75.

which they would deprive him or which they would lessen, but only to that love to which they are opposed.

In such a perspective the question as to whether what one does is of supererogation is simply not raised; for this notion of supererogation has reference to a clearly defined limit, whereas love, of its own nature, has an immanent tendency to be limitless. The norm for judgment of what is supererogatory is somewhat foreign to this plane of love and finds its full intelligibility rather in a conception where there is a contract to be fulfilled, a recompense to be gained if the minimum obligatory is observed. The personal relation of love, in this second type of Christian, has not been superadded extrinsically to his other relations with God, but has interpenetrated them, establishing a new norm of evaluation for his acts, a new way of judging them.

For this second type of Christian, the obligation to tend to perfection, which remains dynamic, will not be suppressed; the motivating force of the divine reward will not be rendered weaker, but both will be operative through his preoccupying effort to love more completely. His obligation to perfection will be visualized by a Christian of this class rather as a fidelity to that love with which God has enriched him.

Fr. Montcheuil seems to have contributed certain insights to the traditional speculations on the subject of the Christian's obligation to perfection that will be of consoling value to many Christians. In no wise does he deny the validity of the traditional approach or its conclusions, but rather he gives us a picture that embodies all of the fruit of previous thought on the subject while opening new avenues for further speculation. The distinction of the two classes which Fr. Montcheuil made could perhaps be a unifying force in reconciling different approaches to the problem.

ROBERT W. GLEASON, S.J.

THE PARISH CREDIT UNION IN THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION SYSTEM

The credit union, the modern descendant of the mediaeval *mont de piété*, is a society organized among a definite group of people and which operates under either a federal or a state charter for the purpose of providing its members with facilities for saving money and for obtaining loans for provident and for productive purposes at reasonable rates of interest. Credit union charters are given only to groups having a definite bond of membership; in the parish credit union the membership base consists of the parishioners of a particular parish.

The first credit union in North America was a Catholic parish credit union. It was founded in 1900 by Alphonse Desjardins in Lévis, Quebec. The first credit union in the United States was a parish credit union. This was also founded by Desjardins in 1909 in the St. Marie Parish in Manchester, New Hampshire.[1] As early as 1913 the Central Verein advocated the formation of credit unions and during the 1920's it put the promotion of parish credit unions on its program of social reform.[2] The Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has a committee organized to encourage the establishment of credit unions on a parish basis.[3]

The philosophy of the credit unions is in the tradition of the social teaching of the Catholic Church. Alphonse Desjardins, the Canadian pioneer who brought the credit union to North America, was knighted by the Pope for his work in organizing these credit societies. One quotation from Desjardins will give a glimpse at the philosophy motivating his efforts:

> A cooperative people's bank [credit union] is not an ordinary financial concern, seeking to enrich its members at the expense of the general public. Neither is it a loan company seeking to make a profit at the expense of the unfortunates who need loans, laboring men suffering from unemployment, agriculturalists suffering from drought or

---

[1] R. F. Bergengren, *Credit Union North America*, (Kingsport: Southern Publishers, 1940), pp. 71-82; 89.

[2] *Social Justice Review*, XLIII, 1 (April 1950), 22.

[3] *The National Catholic Almanac, 1950* (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony's Guild), p. 432.

floods—a company having no mercy for its victims and not hesitating to impoverish them to the extreme limit. The people's bank is nothing of the kind; it is an expression in the field of economics of a high social ideal. It is based upon the high conception, wholly just, equitable and fruitful of "union for life" instead of "struggle for life."[4]

While the credit union is an important ancillary parochial organization in many countries, in the American Catholic parish its position has not yet been determined. From time to time credit union organizers are busy in various dioceses.[5] Some pastors can point to active, successfully functioning parish credit unions; in other parishes credit unions operate with only indifferent results; in still others, credit union liquidations have been carried out. But apart from personal impressions resulting from chance contacts with credit unions, it is difficult to secure reliable information on parish credit unions. Little except promotional literature has been written about this institution. It is the purpose of this study to describe and to analyze the Catholic parish credit unions that are organized under the Federal Credit Union Act.[6] While credit unions have been formed among different religious denominations, this study will be limited to those located in Catholic parishes and to credit unions operating in the Federal credit union system. Parish credit unions operating under state charters fall outside the scope of this study as statistics concerning them are not available.[7]

[4] Quoted in Bergengren, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[5] "Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, Texas, recently established an Archdiocesan Committee to organize, in cooperation with the Texas League, credit unions for every parish in the area. First efforts will be concentrated among the 35 parishes in San Antonio. . . ." *CUNA Organization and Education News,* (Madison, Wis.: Credit Union National Association), Jan. 1950, pp. 4-5.

[6] The statistical material in this study was assembled through the courtesy of Mr. Claude R. Orchard, Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the Federal Security Agency. Mr. Erdis W. Smith, Chief, Division of Programs and Reports, and Mr. Harold Rosenthal, Statistician of the Bureau, co-operated generously in the work of tabulation. At my request tabulating cards containing the records of all of the Catholic parish credit unions in the Federal Credit Union System were assembled and extensive machine tabulations were run off. These tabulations comprise the data upon which this study is based and further references indicating the source of the parish credit union statistics used in this study will not be necessary.

[7] There are no statistics published on state-chartered Catholic parish

Before examining American Catholic parish credit unions, let us determine whether, under conditions that exist at the present time, there is any need for an extension of parish credit union organization. An answer to this question will be given under two headings: (1) the need for a general expansion of the credit union movement, and (2) the particular need for more parish credit unions.

The American pattern of financing family expenditures has changed radically during the past generation. It was not so long ago that a family would borrow money only in cases of extraordinary need. Today borrowing for consumptive purposes is a normal, rather than an unusual practice. This is shown in a recent study sponsored by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.[8]

In this study it was estimated that in 1948 thirty-two million spending units (family units, for the most part) saved part of their incomes, while 15.5 million "dissaved" (i.e. spent in excess of their incomes), and three million neither saved nor dissaved. In other words, 63 per cent of all spending units were classified as positive savers, 31 per cent as negative savers and six per cent as neither. Thus, in recent years, two consumer spending units saved for every spending unit that dissaved.[9]

The study observes that dissaving is not necessarily a result of adverse financial circumstances. It states: "In a sense, the ability to dissave is proof of a certain financial strength because in order to dissave one must have accumulated savings to draw upon or have sufficient income or collateral or both to qualify as an acceptable credit risk." It lists three main reasons for dissaving: first, unusually large and irregular expenditures for special purposes, such as the purchase of durable goods or medical and other services in emergencies; second, a decline in income with no commensurate decline in expenditures; and third, an insufficiency of

---

credit unions; but from an earlier study made by Benson Y. Landis one might estimate that there are possibly twice as many state as federal parish credit unions. B. Y. Landis, *The Church and Credit Unions* (New York: Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1947), p. 5.

[8] "1949 Survey of Consumer Finances," Part VIII. Distribution of Consumer Saving in 1948," *Federal Reserve Bulletin,* xxxvi, 1 (Jan. 1950), 14-34.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 14 ff.

income to maintain regular expenditures. As the study concludes:

> Dissaving for special purposes and occasions appears to be part of the normal life cycle of the family. It frequently accompanies the furnishing of a new home, the taking of a long-planned vacation, the purchase of an automobile, the college education of children, and their marriage. . . . Large expenditures also normally occur because of emergencies or need for medical care, including maternity cases. . . .[10]

While the principal form of dissaving seems to be the reduction of family assets, the next most frequent form is an increase of consumer indebtedness. In 1948 one-fourth of all spending units reported an increase in consumer debt and there was an increase over 1947 in the proportion that used credit.[11]

At the end of 1948 in the United States total consumer credit amounted to $16,319,000,000; of this $8,600,000,000 was installment credit. Of the $8 billion of installment credit $4,072,000,000 consisted of loans; and of this sum only $312,000,000 or 7.6 per cent of the total loans outstanding, was in credit union loans.[12] The remaining $3,760,000,000 in consumer loans were held by commercial banks, small loan companies, industrial banks and industrial loan companies. And while commercial banks under certain conditions charge interest rates comparable with credit union rates, small loan companies and other types of finance companies charge exorbitant interest rates of from 24 to 36 per cent, or even higher.[13]

In other words the tremendous sums borrowed by consumers from finance companies and the high rates of interest that are charged on these loans indicate a general need for more credit unions. The 9000 credit unions in the United States, serving some 4,000,000 members, are an inadequate number to meet the pressing need for low-cost consumption credit.

A study of the purposes for which credit union loans were granted in 1948, made by E. W. Smith of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions,[14] shows that the three most important reasons for borrowing were stated as "payment of current living expenses,"

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 20 f. [11] *Ibid.* p. 25.

[12] *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, xxxvi, 1 (Jan. 1950), 98.

[13] E. F. Donaldson, *Personal Finance* (New York: Ronald Press, 1948), pp. 43-47.

[14] E. W. Smith, "Federal Credit Union Loans, 1948," *Social Security Bulletin*, xii, 7 (July 1949).

"consolidation of debts," and "payment of medical, dental and hospital expenses for adult members of the family." These items reflect the serious need on the part of the family units involved and the service of the credit union both in relieving distress and in providing for pressing family needs.

The fact that more than 84 per cent of the existing federal credit unions are organized on an occupational basis[15]—they are usually organized among the employees of business establishments—points to a special need for parish credit unions. The parish credit union will give a measure of security to large numbers of people who will never be eligible for membership in an occupational type of credit union: the self-employed, those working in small business establishments—indeed the small business men themselves—the professional men, the farmers, the retired workers and many others who belong to no group, other than the parish group, in which a credit union may be organized.

At the end of 1948 there were in the United States 134 federal parish credit unions, with 39,000 members and assets of $4,800,000. These were located in 15 states, with 45 in Ohio, 26 in New York, 20 in Pennsylvania, ten in Connecticut and the remainder scattered among Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Texas and West Virginia. A third of these credit unions are small, with assets of $10,000 or less. Around 60 per cent have assets between $10,000 and $100,000, while only six per cent have assets exceeding $100,000. This top six per cent, however, hold 44 per cent of the total assets, while the bottom third hold only four per cent of the total assets.

The consolidated balance sheet of the 134 parish credit unions presents the financial condition of these credit unions at the end of 1948. On the asset side, loans to members of $2,300,000 comprise almost half of the total assets. Investments in government bonds of $1,400,000 and in Federal Savings and Loan shares of $450,000 and cash items of $550,000, plus minor items make up the total of $4,800,000. The bulk of the liabilities consist of Shares to the amount of $4,450,000. The three reserve accounts amount to around $280,000. Accounts and notes payable are only slightly over $72,000, or only 1.5 per cent of the total liabilities.

[15] *Federal Credit Unions, Report of Operations for the Year 1948* (Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency, 1949), p. 10.

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET OF 134 FEDERAL PARISH CREDIT UNIONS, DEC. 31, 1948

Assets		*Liabilities*	
Loans to members	$2,319,889	Notes Payable	$ 70,821
Cash	554,388	Accounts Payable and other liabilities	1,911
U. S. Government obligations	1,417,041	Shares	4,452,278
Fed. saving and loan	452,651	Reserve for bad loans	112,985
Loans to other credit unions	33,800	Special reserve for delinquent loans	9,734
Other	27,515	Undivided profits	157,555
Total	$4,805,284	Total	$4,805,284

Figures on the operation of the parish group for the year 1948 are found in the Income and Expense Statement. According to this statement, the 134 parish credit unions had a total income for the year of $249,000. Interest on loans amounting to $198,000 made up almost four-fifths of the income, and income from investments of $48,000, plus $2,900 in other income, made up the other fifth. Total expenses amounted to $104,000, leaving a net profit of $145,000, or 58 per cent. This would seem to be a high rate of profit, due, no doubt, to the large amount of gratuitous service given by the officials and the absorption by the parish of many overhead expense items.

INCOME AND EXPENSE STATEMENT OF 134 FEDERAL PARISH CREDIT UNIONS FOR YEAR 1948

Interest on loans	$197,793
Income from investments	48,419
Other	2,906
Total Income	$249,118
Salaries	$ 45,872
Int. on borrowed money	2,551
Surety bond premiums	3,200
Other	52,319
Total Expense	$103,942
Net Profit	$145,176

The net profit of $145,000 in 1948 was almost double that of 1947, which amounted to only $75,000. The war years were difficult ones for credit unions: many members joined the services,

incomes were high and goods were scarce and consequently there was little borrowing. From 1943 to 1946 profits were low and dividends small as can be seen by the following figures:

	1943	*1944*	*1945*	*1946*	*1947*
Net Profits	$16,480	$24,434	$34,696	$50,444	$74,957
Average dividend rate .	1.07%	1.11%	1.32%	1.89%	2.01%

The continuous increase in average dividend payments from 1943 to 1947 is worthy of note. Statistics for 1948 were not available at the time of writing. Fifty-five credit unions in 1943 paid no dividend, while only 22 did not pay dividends in 1947.

In many other ways this group of parish credit unions shows improvement when considered over a period of years. It should be remembered that the Federal Credit Union Act was passed only in 1934 and that the first credit unions were organized the next year. Of course there are state-chartered credit unions much older, but they are not being considered in this study. As might be expected, credit unions increase in size as they get older. The largest parish credit union in this group, one with over $500,000 in assets, was twelve years old in 1948. The youngest credit unions cluster in the small size groups. Evidently a few of these credit unions have failed to make progress as we find two credit unions seven years old and two nine years old with less than $2,500 in assets. In general, however, size increases with age.

Membership in these credit unions has grown from 26,400 in 1943 to 39,000 in 1948. Average membership has also risen from 204 in 1943 to 291 in 1948. Potential membership did not rise proportionately; it was 163,000 in 1943 and 175,000 in 1948. Total shareholdings almost tripled, rising from $1,500,000 in 1943 to almost $4,500,000 in 1948. The average shareholdings per credit union rose from $12,000 to $33,000 and the average shareholdings per member from $59 to $114 in these same years.

The number of loans and the total amount lent show an annual increase all through the term under consideration; 6,133 loans for a total amount of $820,000 were made in 1943 and in 1948, 14,061 loans totaled $3,400,000. The average loan was $134 in 1943; it rose to $253 in 1947, but slipped back to $242 in 1948. The loans balance at the end of the year increased over fivefold, rising from $457,000 in 1943 to $2,320,000 in 1948. Delinquents also increased from $68,000 to $281,000. It should be observed that

loans classified as "delinquent" are not necessarily bad loans; a large number of them are undoubtedly only technically delinquent, i.e. the borrower is in arrears on his payments, but the loan will eventually be collected. At any rate, reserve items—Reserve for Bad Loans, Special Reserve for Delinquent Loans and Undivided Profits—totaled slightly over $280,000 in 1948; so the loan delinquency position does not seem to be unsafe.

Taken by themselves these statistics would seem to show a steady and a substantial growth in recent years. Growth and efficiency, however, are relative terms and can perhaps be approached by a comparison of the parish credit unions with other credit unions. In the following table, four significant ratios of growth or service have been calculated for the group of parish credit unions under consideration and for all of the credit unions in the Federal credit union system.

The first ratio, the ratio of actual to potential membership shows that while all of the Federal credit unions had enrolled from 32 to 38 per cent of their potential membership during the period under consideration, the parish credit unions had as actual members only from 16 to 22 per cent of their potential membership. This would seem to show that the parish group is not campaigning as aggressively for members as is the average credit union, or at least that the need for a credit union is not appreciated as greatly by the potential members of the parish group as by those of the average credit union.

The average share balance per member is consistently lower in the parish group than in the national average. This shows that the members of the parish credit unions are not using the savings facilities of their societies as much as are other credit union members.

The third ratio, the percentage of assets in loans, to members, shows the least difference between the two groups. While on the average the parish credit unions do not have as large a percentage of their assets in loans to members as all of the credit unions taken together, the difference is not great and perhaps not very significant.

The fourth ratio, the percentage of loans granted to total members, however, shows a great difference. The national percentage is, roughly, about twice that of the parish credit unions. This ratio

taken in conjunction with the third ratio indicates that while approximately the same percentage of the total assets are lent to members, the loan activity in the parish group is much slower; in other words the loans granted in parish credit unions are for larger amounts, or for longer periods of time, or some combination of these factors.

TABLE IV

RATIOS OF GROWTH OR SERVICE, FEDERAL PARISH CREDIT UNIONS COMPARED WITH ALL FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS, 1943-1948*

Year	(1) Ratio of actual to potential membership		(2) Average share balance per member (dollars)		(3) Percentage of assets in loans to members		(4) Percentage of loans granted to total members	
	All credit unions	Parish credit unions	All credit unions	Parish credit unions	All credit unions	Parish credit unions	All credit unions	Parish credit unions
1943	32.6	16.2	$ 89	$ 59	27.7	28.7	51.3	23.2
1944	33.4	17.2	102	76	23.8	21.5	50.8	22.0
1945	34.9	18.4	116	94	23.0	21.7	49.6	25.2
1946	36.4	19.3	123	100	32.8	33.2	55.6	26.2
1947	37.4	20.1	133	103	43.4	42.4	65.2	30.0
1948	38.6	22.3	144	114	53.3	48.5	74.1	36.0

* The ratios for all credit unions were calculated from statistics in the annual Reports of Operations of Federal Credit Unions, 1943 to 1948 (Washington, D. C.), and those for parish credit unions from the tabulations made for this study.

Unfortunately in all four of these comparisons the parish credit unions tend to show up somewhat unfavorably. Without a doubt the conditions under which the parish credit unions operate—among more or less scattered, loosely-knit groups of people on different income levels, in comparison with the intimate contact and close association of industrial or occupational groups where the potential members are more on the same income levels—would account for much of this difference. However in spite of this qualification, these ratios would seem to point to opportunities for further growth and a greater extension of service to the members of the existing parish credit unions.

The actual organization of a parish credit union is not difficult, although a careful preparation should be made preliminary to

organizing. Credit union leagues—non-profit, non-sectarian associations—now exist in almost every state for the purpose of assisting groups in their problems of organization and operation of credit unions. Many of these leagues have full-time, professional directors who are always anxious to assist a group to organize. A letter either to the Credit Union National Association at Madison, Wisconsin, or to the Federal Credit Union Bureau at Washington will be referred to the appropriate state league.[16] The tradition of service and friendly assistance is strong in the credit union movement. The state leagues or the National Association will supply interested parties with appropriate literature. The Federal Credit Union Bureau publishes an outline of the procedure for organizing a federal credit union.[17]

While the technical details of organization are simple, to inculcate the officials and members of the new society with a Christian spirit of social charity is more difficult. It can best be approached through discussion and study groups. Possibly the nucleus of such groups might be found in the Holy Name Society or in some other parish organization. After it has been organized the credit union will serve as a school for parish and civic leaders. Indeed, the experience in leadership and business management acquired by the officials of a credit union is a most valuable by-product of the organization.

While the averages and statistics presented in this article conceal details of the actual operation of parish credit unions, they demonstrate that in well over a hundred parishes credit unions are operating profitably and providing parishioners with facilities for saving their money and for obtaining loans in time of need. The number of cases analyzed in this study would seem to be sufficient to establish the practicability of the credit union as an auxiliary agency of a well organized parish. With over 14,000 Catholic parishes in the United States, the parish credit union has considerable opportunity for extension.

J. T. Croteau
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[16] Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C.; The Credit Union National Association, Raiffeisen House, Madison, Wisconsin.

[17] *Procedure for Organizing Federal Credit Unions* (Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency, 1949).

Answers to Questions

LOW MASS OF A BISHOP

Question: At our church we have a Bishop offer Mass frequently. In what respect do the ceremonies differ? I am interested in training my altar boys correctly.

Answer: We presume that the Bishop vests in the sacristy. After the Bishop has recited the *Indulgentiam* at the foot of the altar, the server presents the maniple to him. After the ablution but before the *communio* the servers present the ewer and basin at the epistle side of the altar so that the Bishop can wash his hands. Stehle informs us that the Bishop does not wash his hands after Mass.

The altar boys should be instructed to answer, at the time of the blessing: (a) *Ex hoc nunc et usque in saeculum* to the *Sit nomen,* etc.; (b) *Qui fecit caelum et terram* to the *Adjutorium nostrum,* etc.; (c) *Amen* to the *Benedicat vos,* etc.

If one of the servers acts as bugia (candle) bearer, he stands to the right of the book when it is on the epistle side of the altar and to the left of the book when it is at the gospel side of the altar.

The servers might also be warned that after the Gloria the Bishop does not say *Dominus vobiscum* but rather *Pax vobis* to which they answer *Et cum spiritu tuo.*

SCAPULAR MEDAL

Question: If one wears the scapular medal instead of the woolen scapular does he gain all the indulgences? Who can bless the scapular medal? Are there any specifications for the scapular medal?

Answer: In all there are sixteen approved scapulars which are imitations of the habits of religious orders. The brown scapular of the Carmelites is perhaps the most popular and best known. Instead of wearing the scapular (Third Order scapulars are excepted) people are free to wear a medal and still gain the same indulgences and privileges. The medal that is blessed as a scapular medal must bear the image of the Sacred Heart of Our Lord on one side and the image of the Blessed Mother on the reverse side.

The medal need not necessarily be worn around the neck but can be worn in a pocket or on one's clothing. "It also seems necessary to wear the scapular at night" (Bonzelet, *Pastoral Companion*).

The scapular medal can be blessed by any priest who has the faculties to bless the respective scapulars. It is not necessary that one and the same priest bless both the scapular and the medal. A large number of medals can be blessed at once. When a person who has been enrolled with a scapular replaces it with a new scapular, another blessing is not necessary. However, the same is not true of the scapular medal. A new medal does not substitute for the old one, unless it has first been blessed.

HOLY COMMUNION PROBLEMS

Question: Is a grave reason required for a priest to break off part of the large host that he is using at Mass and give it to a communicant, when he is offering Mass at private altar? Is it illicit to put a small host on the paten and consecrate it for the altar boy at a private Mass, when the main altar is being used by another priest? I have a vague recollection that I read somewhere that such a practice was illicit.

Answer: Fr. O'Connell (*The Celebration of Mass*) points out very clearly the answer to this query: "Only in case of absolute necessity (e.g., to give Holy Viaticum, when no other Sacred Particle is available) may he give a part broken from *the Host of his own Mass.*"

We see no objection and know of no forbidding legislation to consecrating a small host for the altar boy when offering Mass at a side or private altar. And this, even though it is possible for him to communicate at the main altar where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved.

INDULGENCE *IN ARTICULO MORTIS*

Question: I am a newly ordained priest and am confused about the conditions necessary for gaining the Apostolic Blessing at the moment of death. Can any priest give this blessing?

Answer: Any priest, even though he is not approved, who assists the dying is authorized to give this blessing, provided he follows the formula found in the ritual.

There are two essential conditions necessary to the gaining this

plenary indulgence by a person in danger of death. The sick person must invoke the Holy Name of Jesus, orally if possible, but at least in his heart. The other condition, frequently overlooked and forgotten, is that the dying person accept death with complete resignation to God's Will. "Both conditions will be fulfilled if the dying person recites the prayer: 'Jesus, for Thee I live; O Jesus, for Thee I die, etc'" (Jone, *Moral Theology*). If possible the dying person should also receive Holy Communion.

CROSS OF CHALICE

Question: In placing the chalice on the altar after taking wine and water and prior to the offertory prayer is there any directive about the cross on the chalice being turned towards the celebrant of the Mass?

Answer: The authorities direct us to make a Greek cross with the chalice over the back part of the corporal and then place the chalice on the corporal. Nothing is mentioned about the cross of the chalice facing the celebrant. Fr. O'Connell in a footnote remarks that generally there is a cross on the base of the chalice to indicate the front of the chalice. However, this is not prescribed by the rubrics, but is usually found and highly recommended since it does indicate the front of the chalice.

PATRONAL OR TITULAR FEAST OF CHURCH

Question: Must I say Mass "pro populo" on the feast of the Visitation, July 2, since it is the title of the parish? Tell me what Office I must say in the parish for which the Visitation is the title? What office must we say during the octave of the Visitation?

Answer: We must distinguish between titular feast and patronal feast. In liturgical language quite a distinction is made in this regard for the title or titular of a church is the Divine Person, Mystery, or Saint in whose honor the church has been solemnly blessed or consecrated and after whom it is named. The patron of a church, place or country is generally that Saint who has been chosen according to the regulations set down by Pope Urban VIII as its special advocate with Almighty God. The regulations for the selection of a patron differ from those of a titular. No beatified person may be selected for patron or titular without a special indult from the Holy See.

Our inquirer very probably refers to the patron of the parish.

The Ordo tells us that a pastor is obliged to offer the "Missa pro populo" on the occasion of the principal patron of the parish. This feast becomes a double of the first class with an octave. There will be a commemoration of the Visitation at Mass and each day at Lauds and Vespers. If, however, an office of simple rating occurs, the office of the Visitation will be said.

The feast of the titular must also be celebrated each year as a primary feast, a double of the first class with an octave. In both instances the Masses and office for the feast and the octave must be said by all the priests strictly attached to that parish.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

WAR PROBLEMS

Question 1: What course should be followed by a Catholic in the air corps if he is commanded to bomb a target which he knows is not a lawful military objective according to Catholic principles?

Question 2: What advice should a Catholic chaplain give when such a case is submitted to him for judgment by the soldier in question?

Question 3: Is it lawful for a young man to enter the air service if he realizes that he may be commanded to participate in activities forbidden by the law of God?

Answer 1: If a soldier is commanded to do something which he knows is forbidden by the law of God, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, he must refuse to obey, no matter how grave the consequences. Even if he foresaw that he would be courtmartialed and perhaps punished by death, he would not be justified in violating the law of God—for example, by directly bombing a group of noncombatants. It is interesting to note that the Nuremberg tribunal upheld the principle that "the fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior shall not free him from responsibility" (cf. Kenny, *Moral Aspects of Nuremberg* [Washington, 1949], p. 55). It is to be hoped that as a correlative of this principle our government would judge a soldier deserving of praise if he disobeyed a command in war when he is convinced in conscience that what is commanded is against God's law. However, if a soldier only doubts as to the lawfulness of what is commanded, he may and should obey, since

it is a general principle that a subject is bound to submit to lawful authority unless he is sure that what is being required of him is sinful. Such would be the case of the airman who is told to bomb a military objective, but is not certain whether the advantages to his side will be sufficiently great to justify the concomitant destruction of a considerable number of noncombatants.

Answer 2: If a soldier explicitly proposes to a chaplain a problem as to the morality of a mission assigned to him, the chaplain should give him a correct and definite answer, as far as this is possible, according to Catholic principles. Thus, if the young man asks about the morality of a direct attack on noncombatants, it is the duty of the chaplain to inform him that this is contrary to the divine law, and cannot be justified under any circumstances. However, when the chaplain is not consulted, he is ordinarily not bound to take the initiative in condemning a measure, even though he is certain that it is unlawful, since usually such a protest would be futile.

Answer 3: Since not all the activities of our air force in war are opposed to the law of God, it is not forbidden to a young man to enter this branch of the service, as long as he is determined to take no part in any particular activities that are unlawful. However, it is most desirable that Catholics who enter the air corps (in which moral problems of warfare are most likely to arise) should receive from the priests assigned to their spiritual care adequate instructions as to the laws of God concerning the means and methods of waging war, and should be told that in the event of a conflict between the law of God and a military command, they must obey the law of God.

THE AGE OF ORDINATION

Question: Has there been any recent legislation on the part of the Church requiring that a man be twenty-six years of age before he may be ordained to the priesthood?

Answer: The general law of the Church prescribes that a young man be at least twenty-four years old before being ordained to the priesthood (Can. 975), and I have not heard of any recent legislation modifying this prescription. However, in the case of those granted the privilege of ordination to the priesthood at the end of the third year of theology (a privilege granted to the members of certain religious institutes) it has been customary in recent years

for the Holy See to add a condition that only those who have completed their twenty-sixth year may enjoy it. Perhaps it is to this stipulation that our questioner refers.

CANDIDATES FOR THE MINOR SEMINARY

Question: Should a priest, consulted by a boy in the matter of vocation, require that the boy manifest positive signs of virtue before approving the boy's wish to enter a minor seminary? I refer especially to the practice of chastity.

Answer: We cannot expect a boy of thirteen or fourteen—the usual age for entrance into the lowest class of a minor seminary—to possess the strong and constant virtue required of one who is soon to receive the priesthood. But, on the other hand, the mere fact that a boy expresses the desire to study for the priesthood does not justify a priest in giving approval to the boy to apply for admission to the minor seminary. Even in his earlier years some moral qualifications should be required of a boy to indicate that he sincerely desires to attain to the sanctity of life expected of a priest. As to the matter of chastity, expressly mentioned by the questioner, it certainly would be wrong for a priest to consent that a boy should begin his studies for the priesthood if the youth has the habit of grave sins against purity and has not clearly proved that he is seriously and energetically striving to overcome this habit. To take a concrete example: a boy tells his confessor that he wishes to become a priest and is planning to enter a minor seminary in three or four months. But the boy is accustomed to violate chastity once or twice a week. The confessor should inform him that he must make an heroic effort to overcome this habit, if he wishes to obtain his (the confessor's) approval of his plan. If, in the course of the next few months the boy succeeds in eradicating the sinful habit, or at least in considerably diminishing the number of lapses, he may be permitted to apply for admission to the minor seminary; otherwise, the confessor should inform him that as yet he has given no adequate signs of a priestly vocation. If those priests whom boys consult about their plans to study for the priesthood regarded it as a duty to deter from entering the minor seminary any boy whose habitual conduct gives no indication of a vocation, there would not be so many withdrawals from such institutions in the course of the first year.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

The issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* dated May 26, 1951, reports the allocution which our Holy Father addressed on April 3, 1951,[1] to the assembled delegates of Italian Catholic Action. After telling them that they must read in his eyes the joy he felt in seeing them assembled before him, he addressed himself to certain fundamental principles underlying Catholic Action as such.

First he adverted to the characteristic which distinguishes Catholic Action from other Catholic associations. The latter, he said, have a specific purpose from which their name is usually derived, while Catholic Action has a general aim. As a consequence of this, he concluded, the members of Catholic Action are not a fixed axis around which the machinery of an organization moves but rather a gathering of Catholics who are men of action. Therefore, it should not be expected, he insisted, that in Catholic Action there should be merely honorary members.

In pursuing the apostolate of the Church, he affirmed, Catholic Action has not been created as an essentially new element in the structure of the Church; it is not an apostolate of the laity collateral to that of the apostolate of the priesthood, but rather subordinate to the latter. Catholic Action, he asserted, aims only to give to the traditional co-operation of the laity with the clergy a new form and an accidental organization to render it more fruitful. Even when its activities transcend parish boundaries, they remain subject to the authority of the bishop or his delegates.

Inasmuch as the activity of Catholic Action in the religious and social fields is limited by the mission of the Church, our Holy Father demonstrated that this mission is the sanctification of souls and the conversion of the interior man through which, as the best of all means, the cure of social evils is then attained.

In Catholic Action the individual members must preserve spontaneity and independence in regard to the association itself, for they are not mere spokes of a wheel to be moved only when the

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLIII (1951), 375.

hub is turned. They should be anxious to exert a personal moral influence by winning for themselves the respect necessary to obtain the sympathetic ear of those who can profit by their counsel.

Catholic Action is not a power in party politics. On the other hand, Catholic citizens have a right to form an association for political activity and members of Catholic Action can join such an association.

The fact that Catholic Action is immediately subject to the hierarchy should not be construed to give it a pre-eminence in relation to other associations whose purpose does not require, or might even render inopportune, such immediate direction, since these organizations remain, in spite of this, Catholic associations united with the hierarchy.

Our Holy Father, as a final admonition, reminded his hearers that, while the structure of Catholic Action is adaptable to the needs created by various regions and circumstances, there is one characteristic in which all its members must be equal and that is in their determination to think with the Church (*sentire cum Ecclesia*).

In another allocution, delivered May 2, 1951,[2] our Holy Father addressed pilgrims of the Dominican Order and pilgrims from Vietnam who had gathered in Rome to be present at the ceremonies of the beatification of the twenty-five martyrs of Tonkin, all of whom, as our Holy Father observed, venerated St. Dominic as their father, variously entitled to be called the latter's sons. The two bishops were members of the Order, as were two of the priests; the other two priests were Dominican tertiaries. To the pilgrims of Vietnam our Holy Father said that the beatification of these martyrs should instill in them a sense of pride in the preservation of the faith in spite of the suffering and death it entailed, as well as a strong feeling of hope based on the efficacy of the blood of the missioners which, in martyrdom, has been mixed with the blood of their own countrymen. On them all he bestowed his Apostolic Benediction.

Anniversary observances provided the occasion for three congratulatory epistles written by our Holy Father sent on the sec-

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 379.

ond,[3] the fourth,[4] and the fourteenth[5] of April respectively. The first was sent to His Eminence, Norman Cardinal Gilroy, Archbishop of Sydney, to commemorate the golden jubilee of the establishment of the Australian Commonwealth. The second of the epistles was addressed to His Eminence, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, on the occasion of the first centenary of the founding of the Sodality of SS. Cyril and Methodius. The third epistle was sent to Most Rev. Paul Savino, *Referendarius* of the Sacred Tribunal of the Rota, to mark the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical Academy.

On April 29, 1951,[6] our Holy Father addressed a radio message to the hierarchy and the faithful of the Union of South Africa assembled to celebrate the erection of the hierarchy in that country. In it the Pope noted that it was almost a century and a half since Mass was first offered in Cape Town and that the cathedral of St. Mary had witnessed a growth of a hundred years. While looking back at the past devotion of missioners and at their achievements, our Holy Father insisted that it was of paramount importance to study prayerfully, with devout and eager zeal, the bright vision of limitless progress, an aim that can best be realized through the promotion of vocations among their own people. He insisted that when the Church is served and governed by priests and bishops of their own nation, then would the hopes and prayers of the early missioners be fulfilled and then their long years of toil and sacrifice would be justified.

The Apostolic Letters declaring the beatification of Blessed Placida Viel were dated May 6, 1951.[7] Diocesan patrons were acknowledged in Apostolic Letters of June 1, 1950,[8] and Sept. 6, 1950,[9] respectively. The first of these was concerned with the Diocese of Leopoldina, Brazil; the principal Patroness of this diocese was proclaimed to be the Blessed Virgin under the title of her Immaculate Heart, while secondary Patrons were acknowledged in St. Antonio Maria Claret and St. Thérèse of the Infant Jesus. The second was a favor to the Diocese of Wilcannia in

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 369.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 371.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 373.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 381.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 364.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 363.

Australia the Patroness of which was declared to be Our Lady of Perpetual Help.

An Apostolic Constitution of Feb. 17, 1951,[10] established a cathedral chapter in the Diocese of Gaspé; it permitted that the chapter should be obliged to the recitation of the Divine Office in choir on only two days of the year, namely, the Feast of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel and the Feast of St. Jean de Brébeuf and his companions.

An Apostolic Constitution of Jan. 27, 1951,[11] established the Apostolic Prefecture of Ozamis in territory taken from the Dioceses of Cagayan and Zamboanga, in the Philippine Islands. In Colombia, the Apostolic Vicariate of Caquetà was divided by an Apostolic Constitution of Feb. 8, 1851,[12] which changed the name of the Vicariate to that of Sibundoyo and which established an additional Vicariate, that of Florencia, and a Prefecture, that of Leticia, in the territory thus separated. In Indonesia, the Prefecture Apostolic of Bangka and Billiton was created a Vicariate under the name of the city where the ordinary has his see, Pangkalpinanga, in virtue of an Apostolic Constitution dated Feb. 8, 1951.[13] Under the same date,[14] the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith issued a decree which modified the boundaries of the Archdioceses of Pondicherry and Calcutta.

The appointment of Most Rev. Edward J. Hunkeler, D.D., to the See of Kansas City is reported under date of March 28, 1951.[15]

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 359.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 353.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 356.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 358.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 384.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 384.

Book Reviews

De Poenitentia: Tome II, De contritione et confessione. By Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1951. Pp. 988. $10.00.

The Catholic University of America may point with justifiable pride to this latest contribution to the theology of the sacraments by its distinguished Associate Professor in the School of Sacred Theology. Those already acquainted with Fr. Doronzo's published works will require no introduction to the merits of this latest volume. His first work entitled *De sacramentis in genere* which launched the series in this very important field of theology in 1946, succeeded in winning recognition for its author. His subsequent volume on Baptism and Confirmation, followed shortly thereafter by two on the Eucharist as sacrament and sacrifice and the first volume on Penance not only enhanced the author's reputation as an expert in sacramental theology, but definitely secured for him a place of eminence in theological circles at home and abroad.

Specifically Fr. Doronzo's current publication comes to us as the second in a series of four volumes to be published on the Sacrament of Penance. It devotes all but two pages short of a thousand to an intensive and exhaustive study on contrition and confession. Its predecessor deals with the virtue and sacrament of penance. Two future volumes will be dedicated to a study of satisfaction and absolution, sacramental effects, minister and ceremonies, recipient, followed by a treatise on indulgences. The present work is divided into two parts as the nature of the treatise demands. The first part devotes eleven articles to a consideration of contrition. The second part utilizes the services of more than six hundred pages, comprising twelve articles, to one of the most brilliant and comprehensive discussions available on confession.

After briefly outlining the function of contrition in the Sacrament of Penance and a word anent the difficulties that beset the writer in any proper handling of the subject, difficulties due in no small measure to the vicissitudes of fluctuating opinion together with a magnitude of theological distinction brought to bear upon the topic, Fr. Doronzo forthwith enters upon a scholarly and scientific disquisition into every phase and facet of contrition. Let it be said at the outset his commentary is noteworthy for the same favorable features, clarity of

expression and thoroughness of treatment so characteristic of all his writings. Following the order of the Supplement for the most part, Fr. Doronzo proceeds along traditional lines revealing meanwhile a judicious blending of positive and speculative theology with a somewhat pronounced preference for the latter. Thoroughly conversant with the pertinent theological literature, he unfolds a magnificent panorama of the varying shade and hue of the theological contribution of the ages, culminating in the lustrous efforts of recent Catholic scholarship.

Fr. Doronzo postulates a certain middle effect between the Sacrament of Penance and the grace it produces in the soul known to all as the *res et sacramentum*. The sacrament, he reminds us, was not instituted to be a substitute for the penance of the penitent. Rather it was established to aid and support penance which though weak and insufficient in itself may attain to the required sufficiency through the medium of the divine concursus operating in the sacrament. He requires nothing else for the *res et sacramentum* than interior contrition and that alone, provided it comes under the influence of the sacrament (p. 145).

It is interesting to note that the author devotes more than three-quarters of his book to the treatise on confession. Though there is a wealth of material published on confession, there are on the other hand certain phases of it still veiled in many a dim and patristic page, especially auricular confession and the ancient penitential practice. It is the merit of Doronzo's work that his approach is as fresh and as up-to-date as television to which he gives passing mention in one of his practical asides in the treatise on the qualities of confession.

Having made a brief observation on the object, division and definition of sacramental confession (pp. 340-44), Fr. Doronzo stops to devote some time to the consideration of confession viewed as an elicited act of the virtue of penance (pp. 345-48). In the ensuing article he enters upon a lengthy and comprehensive study of the question whether sacramental confession, like the Sacrament of Penance, is necessary by divine law for the remission of sin (pp. 348-464). This question is not to be confused with a subsequent question on the necessity of confession as a necessity of means, which merits its own individual discussion. In dealing with the question with which we are concerned, Fr. Doronzo manages to treat two distinct questions within the limits of one and the same article (pp. 348-464). Even non-Catholic adversaries will agree that the necessity of confession necessarily includes the necessity of the sacrament. Many authors, following the lead of St. Thomas (*Suppl.*, q. 6), are wont to treat the questions separately. However the positive aspect under which both questions are viewed obviates separate consideration together with the repetition and confusion

that usually follow in the wake of such treatment. As a result of this unified treatment we have a recapitulation of all the arguments and proofs, pro and con, together with a greater marshalling of the forces of theological doctrine and opinion at our disposal in concentrated form.

After discussing the integrity of confession, Fr. Doronzo supplements his treatise with a number of questions, nineteen in all, freely discussed by modern dogmatists and moralists involving a number of difficulties and controversies on the point (pp. 564-680). Thirteen distinct notes are devoted to a discussion on the material integrity of confession while six more deal with its formal integrity. The study of these notes is important to theologians of both categories. Their discussion will find particular welcome among those interested in the preparation and direction of theological conferences as well as priests and students desiring a more specialized and comprehensive treatment than that usually available in the ordinary theological textbook.

Fr. Doronzo displays a new approach to the old problem of private or auricular confession by his ingenious handling of the fourth and last quality of confession, its private and secret character in its application to the penitent, the Church and the confessor (pp. 727-849). Three questions bearing on this attribute are proposed for study: whether confession should be secret on the part of the penitent so that he may not reveal his sins in a sacramental way to other than the confessor; whether confession ought to be secret on the part of the Church so that she may not obligate the penitent to a public sacramental confession of sins for the purpose of receiving absolution from them; whether confession should be secret on the part of the confessor to the extent that he is obligated not to reveal directly or indirectly any sin confessed as such by the penitent, being bound thereby to the observance of the sacramental seal (pp. 727-849). Each of these three questions is treated in a distinct article.

The final and concluding article of this very excellent work devotes itself entirely to the much disputed controversy on public and private penance in the ancient Church. Having made an adequate presentation of the nature and scope of the study, the author proceeds to furnish an historical conspectus of the penitential practice throughout the controverted era (pp. 859-62). He makes clear too why he has selected to treat the problem here at the conclusion of the treatise on confession. He emphasizes the relationship that exists between public penance and the sacramental seal. Four questions embody the whole discussion. The first two consider the sacramental nature of public penance and its affiliation with satisfaction and absolution; the third treats of its necessity viewed in its relationship to the sacramental seal; the fourth treats it in relation to private penance and endeavors to ascertain if

public penance was the only form of penance in existence in the early Church to the exclusion of private penance probably introduced at a later period or if both existed simultaneously, and if so in what sense. Fr. Doronzo devotes to each of these questions the full measure of his erudition and acumen. Being thoroughly familiar with the literature and documents pertinent to a proper handling of the subject, he is effective in dispelling some of the confusion, so much a part of this discussion. He is completely on his guard against uncritical acceptance of theories and opinions which militate against a proper solution of the problem. As a result he has subjected the whole mass of evidence along with the opinions and suggestions of his predecessors and contemporaries to the minutest examination.

Fr. Doronzo's conclusions on the matter are four in number, the fruit of patient, proficient and ingenious labor. In the first we gather that public penance as practiced in the ancient Church was not merely a disciplinary practice or performance of a satisfaction imposed in the external forum, but was on the contrary, sacramental in nature (p. 923). Second, public penance was performed after the reception of sacramental absolution and not before it, as is the practice today. On the other hand the absolution which terminated public penance was not a sacramental absolution from the guilt of sin (p. 924). The third conclusion reveals that public penance was not absolutely necessary for the reception of sacramental absolution for either public or occult sins submitted to the power of the keys lest the seal risk violation through such public performance of penance (p. 958). The fourth and final conclusion indicates that public penance, although the principal and *per se* the ordinary penitential practice in the ancient Church, was not the only form. There existed along with it a form of private penance, by means of which sins were remitted without adherence to a special group of penitents or submission to its solemn ritual (p. 970).

After introducing the question of public and private penance in the concluding article of this volume, Fr. Doronzo presents a lengthy bibliography including all the important works, ancient and modern, of Catholic as well as non-Catholic authorship, which touch upon this controversy (pp. 850-3). He further appends a list of excerpts from the critical reviews of learned Catholic writers and theologians on the merits of the various works which have been published on this important and interesting study (pp. 853-8). Five excellent indices, spread over forty-nine pages, complete this work and are accordingly indicated as Index Biblicus, Exegeticus, Thomisticus, Onamasticus and Analyticus. So complete and elaborate an index will prove an invaluable convenience to the student.

The publishers are to be commended with the author for making available a work of this character. While not intended to be used as a seminary manual it will fill the need of those among the clergy who seek a deeper and more comprehensive study in this particular branch of sacramental theology. Because of the wide treatment accorded the subject so as to include moral and juridical aspects of the questions discussed on a number of occasions, it will find a welcome among students of these related fields of theology. Containing as it does an exhaustive contribution of primary and secondary source material together with the verbatim transcription of all the best theological thought on the subjects discussed, it will prove an indispensable instrument for references in the reading rooms of seminaries as well as in rectories and religious houses. To every student engaged in the pursuit of higher studies in the theology of the sacraments it will render the services of a ready and time saving companion.

JOHN F. DWYER

MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE CONFESSIONS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, Second Series, 55. By John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951. Pp. 168. $2.00.

In the selection of Saint Augustine's autobiography as the subject of his doctrinal dissertation Fr. Harvey shows himself to be a man possessed of a good measure of practical wisdom. For this book is not only a perennial favorite with the reading public, but one that is being promoted today, in certain American educational circles, as a "Great Book." Hence a well-ordered examination of it, such as Fr. Harvey provides, is bound to be welcomed in many quarters.

The plan upon which the four central chapters of this thesis are built could hardly be improved. First there is an analysis of Augustine's frequently repeated concept that the goal of man is God alone. Then, since the idea of a goal immediately brings up the question of the road leading thither, attention is given next to the holy Doctor's ideas on the way to God. Here are found outlined the teaching of the *Confessions* on such topics as law, conscience, grace, and the various virtues, particularly charity and humility, as paths leading man to God and happiness. The third chapter takes account of the fact that as on any other road one may meet obstacles also along the path to God. These moral hindrances include ignorance, concupiscence, division of will, bad habit, defective education, and sin in all its ramifications. Since the saintly Bishop, however, is never content with such merely negative elements, we find him supplying his readers with many valu-

able hints on aids in their struggles against such obstacles. The author groups these under the heading of *remedies.* He examines three at length: good example, Scriptural reading, and healing grace. Even this sparse description of its contents reveals how faithfully the thesis follows the logical plan used today in systematic manuals of fundamental moral theology.

It has been said that in the *Confessions* Augustine gives us not only his teaching but himself. In other words that he gives us each truth in the concrete experience in which he learned it. This demands the possession, on the part of one who proposes to master the work, of a sound psychology and a sound theology. In Fr. Harvey we have a student with these desired qualifications. For he has done graduate work in both these disciplines. Evidence of this is found on every page of his work. He is to be complimented also on the easy flow as well as the modern tone of the language used to convey his thoughts.

To be regretted, however, though this is not said in any spirit of criticism, is the fact that the author did not find it possible to provide a summary of the entire moral theology of Saint Augustine. It would truly be a great service to English readers to be given a work with the scope for example of Mausbach, *Die Ethik des heiligen Augustinus,* or Roland-Gosselin, *La Morale de Saint Augustin.* Someday perhaps he may find time for that, particularly since he is already well acquainted with these writers in the original. The *Confessions* after all, as the author himself would be the first to admit, is not the place in Augustine where the real gold of his moral doctrine is to be mined. This single finding may perhaps suffice to prove that point. Vermeersch cites Augustine about a score of times throughout the four volumes of his *Moral Theology.* Yet curious to relate not a single one of these references is to the *Confessions.* To repeat, this is pointed out apart from any intention to detract from the merits of the book under consideration.

Readers may be surprised at finding the name of Augustine's mother spelled with a double "n." Technically this is correct but I doubt that any change in our past procedure is likely. Hence it would have been wiser to follow the common usage, in agreement with Fr. Martindale's dictum on the new spelling, "it would seem pedantic so to spell it here."

Readers will like this book for its own excellent qualities. They will enjoy it also because of the Augustine story which it relates. They will savor the turn of phrase at which the Saint was so adept, the revelation of his great love of God, and his humble avowals throughout the description of his struggles against temptation. Preachers and confessors will find usable material in the chapter on remedies. The book finally ought to help all to heed the advice of Pope Pius XI, given in his

Encyclical commemorating the fifteenth centennial of Augustine's death, "Today it behooves them [the faithful] to imbue and nourish themselves with his doctrine, to follow the example he gave of holiest living."

THOMAS W. SMIDDY

DER LEHRSTUCK-KATECHISMUS ALS EIN TRAGER DER KATECHETISCHEN ERNEUERUNG. By Franz Michel Willam. Freiburg: Herder, 1949. Pp. x + 167.

Since the first world war a movement has grown up in Europe and America to present Christian doctrine even to grade school children in the form of articulated, unified discourses on one or more related points of doctrine rather than in the classical, catechetical style of question and answer. The method is supplemented by questions on the text of the discourse or exposition. It is thought that the new form will conduce to a more intelligent grasp not only of individual teachings but of the interrelationship subsisting between them. The question and answer system is deemed to be less suitable for the inculcation of the ideas propounded in the Holy Father's encyclicals *Mystici Corporis* and *Divino afflante Spiritu*.

In the present volume the author purposes to show how the new method, which he favors, is exemplified in manuals of Christian doctrine used in England, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, and the United States. He does so by choosing lessons from approved textbooks employed in these countries and translating them into German. Furthermore, he divides these lessons into two classes: (1) those derived from manuals primarily stressing the pedagogical aspect of the catechetical revival; (2) those taken from manuals which predominantly contemplate the theological aspect. In these classes he groups his translated selections according to the country of their origin. In the third chapter he makes some observations on the Belgian catechism, the unified French catechism, and the new Dutch catechism. In a concluding chapter he reviews the motives which prompted the rise and spread of the new pedagogical method. He believes that a unified method of catechetical instruction for the Catholic world is possible and compares the system which he advocates with that supposedly in vogue in early Christianity.

The book will prove highly stimulating and instructive to priests and